

AP The NOV 6 1954
PERIODICAL
READING ROOM
London Quarterly
&
Holborn Review

LITERATURE · HISTORY · SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION · THEOLOGY · PHILOSOPHY
EDITOR · J. ALAN KAY, M.A., PH.D.

Contributors Include

RELIGIOUS DRAMA

PAMELA KEILY
CARINA ROBINS
CYRIL J. THOMAS
R. H. WARD

FRANK BAKER, B.A., B.D., PH.D.
OLIVER A. BECKERLEGGE, M.A., PH.D.
WILLIAM MACHIN, M.A.
C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.
W. SMITH

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD, M.A., PH.D., D.D., D.LITT.
A. SKEVINGTON WOOD, B.A., PH.D.

London

THE EPWORTH PRESS

(FRANK H. CUMBERS)

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

OCTOBER 1954 · PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS NET

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
 is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments: by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	245	Church Union (North India and Pakistan) by William Machin, M.A.	281
The Nature of Religious Drama by R. H. Ward	251	Odic Force—A Rediscovered Healing Power by Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A., PH.D., D.D., D.LITT.	285
The Effect of Religious Drama on the Actor by Carina Robins	256	Jonathan Swift and the Wesleys by Frank Baker, B.A., B.D., PH.D.	290
The Effect of Religious Drama on the Audience by Pamela Keily	260	George Burnett (1734-93) by A. Skevington Wood, B.A., PH.D.	300
The Value of Religious Drama to the Methodist Church by Cyril J. Thomas	264	Recent Literature Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	308
The Chronology of Acts and Epistles by W. Smith	270	From My New Shelf by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	320
Is Christianity the Enemy of Progress by Oliver A. Beckerlegge, M.A., PH.D.	277	Our Contributors	324

Britain's First Care —the Children !

Among the many questions engaging the attention of religious and social workers, none is more important than the one concerning children who start life handicapped by orphanhood or neglect.

For eighty-five years the National Children's Home has been helping these little people, during which period over 37,000 boys and girls have been given the chance which misfortune has denied. The Home still depends on voluntary contributions and an earnest appeal is made for continued and even increased support to meet the rising cost of maintaining this work.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME
 Chief Offices: Highbury Park, London, N.5

Editorial Comments

DRAMA sprang from religion. Semitic drama was always essentially religious; in India dramatic elements first showed themselves in certain of the hymns of the *Rig Veda*, and when these were combined with dances in the festivals of the gods, acted plays were gradually evolved; in Persia an elaborate 'Passion Play' sprang out of an annual religious ceremony of lamentation; the glories of Greek tragedy began in religious observance; and the beginning of native English drama goes back to the Miracle and Mystery plays of the Middle Ages, which in turn developed out of the services of the Church.

More recently there has been a long period when drama and the Church have been separated. In most places a play in church would have been looked at askance, and a religious play in a public theatre would have been impossible. But now drama has returned to its mother, religion, and religious plays of varying degrees of merit are being widely performed. It is good, therefore, that the whole subject should be examined, and in this present issue there are four articles about it, three of them from the respective points of view of the dramatist, the actor, and the audience, and the fourth inquiring into the contribution that religious drama can make to Methodism.

One of the hard facts to be reckoned with is that there are as yet comparatively few really first-rate religious plays. That is hardly surprising, because the difficulties to be overcome in the writing of them are immense. The writing of any kind of play is a difficult matter, but when the play is a religious one, all the natural difficulties are intensified and some extra ones are added.

The making of a good play is exacting and exhausting, and demands genuine inspiration, great skill, and real hard work. The mere re-writing of scripture in the form of dialogue instead of narrative is by no means sufficient to produce a biblical play. If the play is to be of any length, it must have a real plot. A mere succession of incidents will not hold the attention of an audience for any length of time, and therefore there must be what is usually called a conflict (either external or internal), or the play will not really grip. There must be an increasing and lowering of tension; the story must cohere so that all things are in some way related together; and when it is ended there must be a sense of something completed and whole, a feeling that the matter has come to a conclusion and has not merely stopped. The characters, too, must be given careful attention, for drama is much less kind than narrative to shortcomings of characterisation. In narrative a character can be described, his mood reported, and his motives stated in a sentence or two; but in drama it is his speech and his actions that have to show him for what he is, express his mood, and unfold his motives. In narrative there is a great deal that can be left vague and shadowy; but in drama, where the character is actually seen, most things have to be defined. The narrative of the Walk to Emmaus does not state whether the two disciples were men, or whether (as some suppose) one was a woman, and there is no need for the reader even to ask the question; but if the incident is dramatised, the writer has to make up his mind on the subject and commit himself to one thing or the other. Not only have plot and characterization to be clarified, but the dialogue, too, has to be given special attention. In narrative there is often no need for much dialogue; it is enough to be told, for example, that when a certain character entered

the room the others were talking. But in drama they have actually to talk about something, and to be listened to with interest by the audience. Moreover, since it is through dialogue that character is portrayed, events are explained, and actions are prepared for and followed up, dialogue has to be invented that is in character and that carries the plot forward.

All this applies to any sort of play, but in the religious play there are additional difficulties to be faced and additional qualities to be presented. A religious play is not merely one that happens to have a religious subject. It is quite possible indeed to dramatize even scripture, and to do it well, without producing a play that is in any true sense religious. *The Stars Bow Down*, by Gordon Daviot, is of that kind. It takes the story of Joseph (what a magnificent story it is!) and dramatizes it with very great skill. All the points we have mentioned, and many more as well, are most carefully attended to, and the Bible narrative is faithfully followed, with only such additions as are in keeping with it and are necessary to make a narrative into a play. The result is very good indeed, but it has practically no religious significance. It is true that God is mentioned perhaps half a dozen times in the course of the play, but only in the same way as the gods of the Egyptians are mentioned—as one of the various deities that men have worshipped and the particular one that Joseph happens to have believed in. The sense that the biblical writer has of Yahweh being the real ruler of the world and guiding history for His own great purpose, so that at the end Joseph can say to his brothers, 'It was not you that sent me hither, but God'—all that is completely lacking. The writer of a religious play must not only tell a religious story, he must put into it a real sense of the action of God.

It may seem superfluous to say that the writer must express a sense of God that is not only real but true; but there are religious plays, and good ones, that say things about Him that are false. In Henri Ghéon's *The Comedian* there is a scene in which Genesius, the actor, is asking his brother Felix, who has become a Christian, what it is that Christians believe. Having had some of his questions answered, he is still puzzled. 'How do you explain', he asks, 'that some believe and others—so many others—do not?' 'That', says Felix, 'is the mystery of the Divine Grace. Sometimes it must be earned.' 'How?' says Genesius. And Felix replies: 'By humiliation, by tears, by suffering.' But grace is something that is received gratis, and it is quite fundamental to the true understanding of our faith that that should be acknowledged. Fortunately this bit of conversation is not at all essential to the plot, and the omission of half a dozen lines easily takes out this blot on what is a very good and moving play.

Similar false doctrine is found in the Morality play *Everyman*. This is one of the most famous of medieval plays, though one cannot help but feel that its historic importance has led to its being over-rated as drama. The chief character, Everyman, has been summoned by Death, and he wishes to have company on his journey; but he is deserted in turn by Fellowship, Knowledge, Strength, Discretion, Five Wits, and Beauty—by everything in fact except Good Deeds. When in the end he dies, we are told that his good deeds will make all sure and that he will be received into heaven because of his 'singular virtue'. The Doctor points the moral that we also shall one day die, and that if the good deeds we take with us are small, then there is no hope for us. It is astonishing that this play, which so bluntly and unfeignedly teaches salvation by works, was performed a few years ago as one of the Methodist Conference plays.

Not only must the religion of the play be true; it must be brought home to the audience as something that is relevant now, and of personal application to all who hear. Even the ordinary secular play must have some contact with the lives of the audience if it is to grip them. But with a religious play it is more than contact that is required; it is application. The events which are seen on the stage must be understood not merely as happenings that took place perhaps 2000 years ago, but as deeds that affect our lives now; the problems of the characters must be shown to be in some way our problems; the God who was active in the events portrayed must be seen as One who is active in the events of today; and as He demanded a response from the men in the play, so He must be perceived as demanding a response from us. A good deal more is said about this in the articles that follow, and there is no need therefore to expand it here. But it would be a serious omission if we failed to point out that in this respect a religious play is something different from a costume play, a historical romance, an entertainment, a tragedy, or even a problem play.

Even when the author has a strong and true sense of God; the path he treads in making a religious play is full of pitfalls. It is not always easy to make a religious play into a unity, and it can only be done when the religion is an essential part of the material with which the play works. Granted that, then almost anything is possible. *Murder in the Cathedral* actually includes a sermon, and so, in effect, though on a different plane, does *Sensation on Budleigh Beacon*; but that is only because, in the first case, Thomas Becket's sermon carries on the development of the play, and, in the second, the whole play leads up to what the Rector of St Saviour's, Budleigh, has discovered about God. If religion is not the subject of the play, then it cannot be tacked on at the end as a moral, or introduced in the middle as an interlude. The audience must not be preached to unless the preaching serves to carry on the action.

A further difficulty is that Christianity is a miraculous religion, and miracles on the stage are always apt to look improbable. It is not merely that one knows very well that no miracle has in fact taken place, and that the actor who stretches out his supposedly withered arm was perfectly healthy all the time. Nor is it only that one's mind is sometimes distracted by the mechanism of the stage effect, and that it would be impossible, for example, to show the Ascension taking place without raising disturbing thoughts about how the trick was worked. The main difficulty is that of making visible the tremendous spiritual power which alone is adequate to produce the miracles one wishes to represent. Even the miracle of a man's conversion, though by no means impossible of representation, is extremely difficult to make wholly convincing, and there are some kinds of conversion that are probably impossible to deal with satisfactorily on the stage. *The Shadow Factory* by Anne Ridler shows the director of a factory who utterly controls the lives of his work-people, and tries to control even their leisure and their thoughts. He is brought to his senses by an artist who paints a picture on the walls of the canteen, showing the director leaning out of the clouds like God, and moving his people about like pawns on a chess board. The director learns his lesson, and at a Nativity Play organized for the staff he offers his power to the baby in the crib and becomes a changed man. The play is, of course, much more impressive than this bald account of the plot, but one cannot help but feel the unlikelihood of such a miraculous result following from such cause as has been shown.

Further difficulties are made by the fact that Christianity is a historical religion. Because of that fact, the dramatist will often wish to represent history; but history is nearly always difficult to make into a play. Sometimes it supplies us with a series of events that is complete and unified and suitable for presentation on a stage; but for the most part, history is an untidy business, with many loose ends and no real stopping-place where things are felt to be complete. Norman Nicholson in *The Old Man of the Mountains* does not manage to bring what is really an extremely good play about Elijah to a satisfactory conclusion, and Christopher Fry in *The Firstborn*, a rich and moving play about Moses in Egypt, similarly fails to leave a proper sense of completeness at the end. Dorothy Sayers confesses to finding a difficulty about the question of unity in her play cycle *The Man Born to be King*, and points out that in order to produce it she has taken 'some liberties with the gospel text—the omission of some incidents, the insertion and expansion of others, the provision of backgrounds and what are technically called "bridges" to link the episodes, and occasional transpositions'. In order to tie some of the parts together, she has found it necessary to identify the centurion whose servant was healed with the believing centurion at the Crucifixion and with one of the soldiers who were responsible for the Massacre of the Innocents, and she has united Mary Magdalene, Mary of Bethany, and the Woman who was a Sinner of Luke 7 into one person. Certainly she has taken such 'liberties' extremely skilfully and convincingly, but it is easy to see that, except in the hands of a skilled, informed, and religious writer, such treatment could become dangerous and misleading.

Another aspect of the difficulty of writing a play about history is that if the dramatist is to make his play live, he must have liberty to express his imagination in it, to add, to interpret, and to fill in detail. It will not do for him merely to reproduce literally what his documents report; he must have freedom to be in some way original. If he is not, the result will not be drama, and will not even be history, but merely dead fact. The medieval dramatist allowed himself plenty of scope here, and exercised a good deal of invention upon people like Noah's wife, Herod, the workmen who set up the Cross, and the soldiers who watched at the tomb. It is very touching to find the shepherds in the Coventry *Nativity Play* wanting to make presents to the infant Jesus and offering Him a shepherd's pipe, a hat and a pair of mittens, and there are many similar inventions. Humour is one of their characteristic additions, and everybody enjoys scenes like that in *The Second Shepherds' Play* in the Townley Cycle, where Mak, the sheep stealer, robs the shepherds of a sheep, hides it in a cradle, and pretends it is his baby. Humour is an excellent thing in a religious play and always seems very much at home there. Not only in this country but in religious plays in India, China, and Africa, it takes a large and popular part. We must remember, however, that the undue increase in the comic element was one of the reasons for the gradual transference of medieval drama from the Church to the secular world, and it is clear that it needs to be kept within bounds. It can be seen how easily the originality and imagination which is necessary for a dramatist may interfere with historical fact, which, in the case of Christianity, is religious fact.

Not only is Christianity a historical religion, but the most important part of it is history that is unique, and it is most difficult to make the unique convincing. As we have seen, the dramatist must have freedom in some degree to be original; but no one could make up a convincing original incident about Jesus, it would be

almost impossible to make up a convincing parable to put into His mouth, and even dialogue that is to be spoken by Him must not stray away from His actual recorded words for very long or it will be quite unacceptable. But where the artist cannot be original he may easily become flat and dull. An expert can cope with this sort of limitation very well in a radio play, but the problem is much greater on the visible stage. When the *York Mystery Plays* were performed during the Festival of Britain, the most unsatisfactory character was that of Jesus. The entirely commendable attempt to treat Him with reverence resulted in a character that was dull, and that not only failed to be divine, but failed to be fully human; the one who should have stood out as the source and centre of Life was much less vivid and virile than the human beings around Him, and certainly less exciting than the devils. It is a very good thing for religious drama that in the ordinary way it is forbidden in this country to show the figure of Christ upon the stage.

But in spite of the number and size of the difficulties in the way, good religious plays exist and produce their effect. Their value lies largely in the fact that they are able to make us feel things, to bring things home to us, as we say. They do this most to those who are acting in them. The actors have to think about every word they speak, find out the meaning of it, and by imagination identify themselves with the character they represent and make those words and meanings their own. Weeks of rehearsal make this process more and more complete, and because the character that is acted has a real correspondence with something in the actor (either what he is, or what he longs to be, or what he is tempted to be), and because the play reveals religious truth which is eternal and therefore contemporary, he comes to see himself and to see God and to know something of what God can do. But the play brings things home to the audience as well, and although perhaps they only see it once, the same things are revealed in some measure to them also.

This happens in three ways. First, as in all art, men are made to share the experience of the artist, in this case the playwright. If he is filled, as Christopher Fry is filled, with a sense of the mystery and vastness of life, with a feeling that we 'look with the earth Over the waterways of space' and that 'Between Our birth and death we may touch understanding As a moth brushes a window with its wing', and if he knows that 'The enterprise Is exploration into God', then we shall feel it also. If the Bible is alive to him, as it was, for instance, to the playwright who wrote *The Sacrifice of Isaac* in the Chester cycle of plays, then it will be alive to us.

Second, we are made to share the experience of the characters whom the dramatist interprets or creates. We know that there is something in us which unites us with the Women of Canterbury in *Murder in the Cathedral*, those who are 'living and partly living'; and we are also made to share the experience of Becket when he says: 'No life here is sought for but mine, And I am not in danger: only near to death.' We say with the man in *The Holy Family*, 'It was my arm that raised the scourge, These fingers twisted the crown of thorns', and we cry with him 'Spare us Lord'. We find ourselves also united with Mary as she says

*Now am I ready, arrayed
In my fulfilment;
Now am I no more afraid:
This is my moment.*

Our uniting with these characters may only be in imagination. But even if we stop

there and do not go in reality with them into the presence of God, we have been shown the way to Him, and when we want Him we know how to go.

Third, we may pass beyond imagination, and, as we have seen, the true religious play invites us to do that. We may be gripped by the reality of what the dramatist is saying and find ourselves, in very truth, in the presence of Him who is not only within the play, but outside it and standing before us, Him who is greater than anything the dramatist has shown about Him, who is concerned not only with the characters of the play but with us, and not only with the events of the play but with all events and therefore with ours. Dr J. W. Welch, in a foreword to *The Man Born to be King*, tells of the gratitude of many listeners for this play sequence by Dorothy Sayers. One wrote to say: '*The Man Born to be King* is quite changing the atmosphere in our house, and where there has been resentment and criticism, we can feel it all dying away in the presence of Christ.' Henri Ghéon, in the preface to *The Comedian*, tells of one young actor who had to pray on the stage and was taught thereby to pray at home, and of other young people who acted in a play about St Maurice, and who thereafter, when they were confronted with a difficult problem of conscience, used to ask: 'What would St Maurice in the play have done?' While this editorial is being written there comes a letter from the leader of a Methodist Youth Club to say that a young man has become a Church Member because the door opened for him when he took a part in *The Man who played Judas* last Easter.

Stories could be multiplied, and they would go back at least as far as the days of the Emperor Diocletian. In the year 303, to please the emperor, the mime Genesius made sport of the Christian mysteries, and while he did so became a Christian. The work of conviction began 'in a moment'. With a mock priest and exorcist at his side and the laughing crowd all round, Genesius cried out: 'I want to receive the grace of Christ, that I may be born again, and be set free from the sins which have been my ruin.' He was baptized on the stage in mockery, but the pantomime turned into reality, and he boldly proclaimed aloud his faith: 'Illustrious emperor, and all you people who have laughed loudly at this parody, believe me, Christ is the true Lord.' When Diocletian understood how matters lay, he ordered Genesius to be tortured with iron claws and burnt with torches. But he kept repeating: 'There is no king except Christ, whom I have seen and worship. For Him I will die a thousand times. I am sorry for my sin, and for becoming so late a soldier of the true King.' At length when all torture had failed, the prefect ordered that he should be beheaded.

J. ALAN KAY

THE NATURE OF RELIGIOUS DRAMA

THERE is a very real sense in which to write about religious drama is to write about the drama in general, and even about religion in general as well; for all drama, and indeed all art which is worthy of the name, is essentially religious, while religion is essentially dramatic or dramatized, in that it manifests itself in a 'doing', whether in ritual or in the religious man's way of living. Both religion and religious drama are concerned with incarnation; they make the word flesh, the invisible visible; they represent the interpenetration of two worlds.

When we think of what is broadly called the drama today it is hard to realize that all drama is religious in origin. Watching the slick West End comedy, all shiny surface and no depth, all outward form (or formalism) and no inward content, it is difficult to remember that the first plays this country saw, only five centuries ago, were re-enactments of the great moments in the Gospel story, and that these plays had priests for their authors and actors. It is significant, too, that the earliest fragment of Christian drama we possess comes from an Easter play about the death and rebirth of the man-God. It is significant, because this leads us still farther back, toward the ancient mystery-religion from which arose the earliest drama, as such, which has come down to us at all—the Greek plays, still recognizably rooted in ritual song and dance. Their content was what we now call mythological; but for the men and women of that time these plays about their familiar gods, kings and heroes will have been as real and 'historical' as the early dramas of our own era (many of them representing god, king and hero in the one person of Jesus) were, and still are, to Christian people.

It is symptomatic of the present time that we find it necessary to use the phrase 'religious drama' at all, and that we can think of religious drama as a thing in itself and separate from the drama as a whole; it is symptomatic of the progressive secularization of life since the Renaissance, and of the separation one from another of the things of every day and the things of Sunday, or, better, of the concerns of the people and the concerns of the Churches. It is true that, as a people, we still pay lip-service to religious values; they emerge, sometimes to our confusion, in our constitution and laws, in our social institutions and even our manners; and it is true that they still make a shadowy and uncertain appearance even in those of our works of art which we do not specify as religious, probably because the artist is by nature the kind of man who sees a meaning and purpose behind the outward forms of life, and binds those forms together in a unity which is essentially religious even if it is not so called. But, to speak generally, religion, at least in its overt and traditional manifestations, has become a thing separate from life. Those who regret this divorce sometimes see in the drama a way of re-marrying life and religion, and when they wish to express this hope they find themselves using the phrase 'religious drama', though thereby in fact they only emphasize the divorce, forgetting that where religion and life are one flesh so are religion and the drama; for, again, all drama which is art, and so concerned with eternal values as well as temporal forms, is by nature religious drama.

Unfortunately the converse does not necessarily follow; all 'religious drama' is not art. Much which passes today for religious drama, whether it is played in theatres or in churches, by secular actors or by those evangelically eager to re-marry religion and life, is no more religious drama in the true sense than the

comedies of Terence Rattigan are religious drama. Certainly many plays which pass today for religious drama are much less religious, and much less Christian, than the plays of the Greek dramatists, to say nothing of those of Shakespeare and many other playwrights usually considered 'secular'. A play is not necessarily religious because it involves a chorus of angels, or because its story is taken from the Bible or based upon the life of a saint, or because its author is a churchman; it is not even necessarily religious because it is a Nativity-play or a Passion-play, or because its theme is recognizably Christian. On the other hand, a play may be a religious play though it says nothing directly of religion and was written by a 'pagan' Greek, a Buddhist monk, the so-called 'atheist' Christopher Marlowe, or the so-called 'rationalist' Henrik Ibsen. It is all too easy for the contemporary Christian person who has enthusiastically embraced the cause of the re-marriage of life and religion to be misled into the belief that a play is religious by the fact that it uses his own Christian terminology; or to be misled into the belief that it is not religious because it makes no immediate and superficial claim to be.

The play's content is of course the determining factor. This is not to say that only content matters where religious drama is in question; as in any art, including that of the religious life, content and form must meet in proper relation, the one appropriately and worthily embodied in the other; inward meaning must be fully symbolized in outward action and word. The most acceptable answer to the question, What must be the content of a play which is in the true sense religious? is contained in Professor Ellis-Fermor's *The Frontiers of Drama*, and especially in the chapters called 'The Limitations of Drama' and '*Samson Agonistes* and Religious Drama', where it is argued that religious drama must be *concerned with religious experience*. To this category Professor Ellis-Fermor will admit comparatively few plays. She names the *Oresteia*, *Everyman*, *Samson Agonistes*, *Brand* and the fifth act of *Peer Gynt*, T. S. Eliot's *The Family Reunion* (which draws its content largely from the *Oresteia*), and two or three more, but she suggests that her readers will be able to add yet other plays to her list. The present writer would amplify it by the addition of Marlowe's *Faustus*, Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, Strindberg's *Easter*, Ghéon's *The Way of the Cross* (a section of a longer play, but complete in itself), and Gabriel Marcel's *A Man of God*.¹

It is not to our purpose to discuss any of these plays in detail. The point is that in all of them one character at least, generally the protagonist, undergoes a religious experience which is essentially the same in every case. That is to say, he begins by being one kind of man; he suffers because he is this kind of man, either for his own sins or for those of others or perhaps for both; and as a result of his suffering he emerges another kind of man. Blake put it in a slightly different way when he said that 'if the fool will persist in his folly he will eventually become wise', and we can sum up the religious experience of the man in question by saying that he dies and is reborn, and that this is the central reality involved in the mythology of all races and ages, including the Christian myth of the crucifixion and resurrection of the man-God.

In *The Duchess of Malfi*, for instance, Bosola is the villain of the piece (or one of them) until it is more than half over; he is an 'intelligencer' or spy paid by his masters to bring the Duchess to ruin and then to encompass her death. But by the very commission of these crimes, by seeing with his own eyes the suffering they inflict upon one unhappy woman, Bosola himself is made to suffer, and in his

suffering he is altered; watching his victim, he sees himself for what he is. Too late, he tries to make amends. In the attempt to avenge Antonio, the Duchess's husband, Bosola loses his own life. The life he lived was a villain's life, but the death he dies is not a villain's death, but a hero's; instead of being glad to see him justly punished, we sympathize with his tragic fate. In the course of the play, then, this strange and mysterious character has not merely 'changed sides' from the evil side of the Duke and the Cardinal to the good side of the Duchess and Antonio; that is only the outward symbol for the inward reality, the alteration which takes place within Bosola's own soul, where the old man dies and a new man is born.

In Gabriel Marcel's *A Man of God* the Protestant pastor, Claude Lemoyne, a man apparently good, selfless, and an exemplar of all the Christian virtues, is also made to see himself for what in fact he is, a man inwardly corrupt, unforgiving, self-concerned and self-deceiving. When this happens and, as he himself says, the unreal man he has believed himself to be is 'destroyed', a new man emerges. This new man is bewildered, lost, his old life and his familiar relationships in ruins about him, but he is real, honest, and face to face at last with the God from whom hitherto he has hidden himself. He wants only one thing, 'to be known as he is', whether to God or to men.

The reason for briefly examining these two examples of the religious play is partly that some might express a certain surprise at finding them so described, and partly that they are not among Professor Ellis-Fermor's examples (and might be considered by her, at least in the case of *The Duchess of Malfi*, which, like *Faustus*, is technically a tragedy, to fall outside her very clearly defined category); but mostly that these examples make abundantly plain, even in so short an exposition of what takes place within the souls of Bosola and Claude Lemoyne, what is meant by religious experience as the essential content of any play which may properly be called religious drama. There is, however, a concomitant aspect of the matter which is of prime importance, and that is the effect of such plays upon their audiences. A play which is in the true sense religious because it is about religious experience within one or more of its characters will also be a religious experience, at least by implication, for those who watch it. It is the religious dramatist's job to ensure that this is so; an exceedingly difficult job, if only because religious experience is by nature exceedingly difficult to 'externalize' in cogent action and speech. The dramatist must be proficient and persuasive enough to make his audiences identify themselves with the experiencer on the stage, thus realizing the possibility of such experience within themselves. He is under the necessity in fact of fulfilling Shakespeare's demand that the play shall 'hold the mirror up to nature'; and this is precisely Marcel's achievement in *A Man of God*. Webster's achievement in the expressly tragic circumstances of *The Duchess of Malfi*, where, however surely we may have refused to identify ourselves with the villainous Bosola of the first part of the play, we are forced to identify ourselves with both the old and the new Bosola before the fall of the curtain, is the fulfilment of Aristotle's complementary demand that tragedy shall purge the soul by pity and terror; in this case, be it said, terror of the religious experience itself, that 'passion' by means of which the hidden man in all of us may painfully be brought, through a death, to a birth.

'A man's life of any worth', said Keats, 'is a continual allegory.' It is an allegory on its own account, in that an enigmatic meaning underlies its everyday surface

of what T. S. Eliot calls 'birth and copulation and death'. But the individual allegory is at the same time part of the collective allegory expressed in mythology, in religious ritual, and in the symbolic stories and pictures of our dreams as they are interpreted by certain schools of psychology. In this context religious drama becomes another name for allegory; for, while it is concerned with the inner meaning of the lives of the individual persons represented by its characters, it is also concerned with the collective meaning underlying the life of mankind as it is exemplified in the individual. In other words, religious drama has a quality which is universal and eternal, not subject, as are the outward forms of life, to place and time. Religious experience is the conscious realization of the allegory and the reading of its enigma; it is the point at which, not only a new man is brought consciously to birth in the experiencing individual, but at which also this new man is paradoxically seen as an aspect of the oldest man of all, the collective Adam Kadmon of the Kabbala, the archetypal 'hero' of contemporary psychology.

The function of religious drama, then, is to re-express in symbols appropriate to a present time and place the timeless and placeless truth which all religions are trying to interpret. It fulfils this function in the way in which allegorical mythology has always done so, through a 'hero' (or a protagonist or perhaps some other character) in whom is worked out that 'salvation' of the individual which is his rebirth to a new manhood after his death in the old manhood. Further, it conveys through him to us who watch the play that consequent 'salvation of his people' of which, as the risen man, the enlightened man, the perfected or integrated man, this hero becomes the vehicle.

That a religious play, in order to achieve its purpose, need have nothing immediately recognizable as 'religious' about its outward form, or the symbols used to express the inward meaning, will be clear from the example of Marcel's *A Man of God*. It is true that here the ironically named man of God is a pastor; but he might in fact have followed some other profession without altering the play's significance, or even, in any radical way, its situations. And Bosola, who becomes in no ironical sense a man of God, is an Italian Renaissance spy in a play having nothing superficially religious about it at all. On the surface Marcel's *A Man of God* is a 'domestic drama' set in the kind of home you or I might live in, whose inhabitants wear the same kinds of clothes, and speak the same kind of language, as we do. Marcel in fact has done for us what Marlowe achieved for his own age in *Faustus*; he has put the contemporary world in touch with the eternal world and brought about an incarnation; he has in the most real and recognizable terms brought the eternal world's salvation to the people by the device of showing it at work among men and women with whom we of the 'Age of Anxiety' can identify ourselves as easily as Marlowe's Renaissance contemporaries could identify themselves with *Faustus*.

We can see here a test of whether a particular drama is religious and the work of a deliberately religious dramatist; for, however loaded it may be with the familiar vestments of religion (the angels in their robes and wings, the biblical characters in their 'biblical' costume), however familiarly religious it may be in its terminology (archaic 'thee and thou' language, the reiteration of the names of the deity), the play which is religiose as opposed to religious will always fail its audience. These hungry sheep may look up at the stage before them, but they will not be fed by what is no more than an empty show. On the other hand,

religious drama as we have defined it demands of its audiences that they shall be directly and experientially concerned in it. It is about themselves; the life of the people on the stage is one with their own, a living reality shared on both sides of the footlights. While it is far from true to say that only plays about contemporary people can be religious plays for contemporary audiences (the *Oedipus at Colonus* and *Faustus* are still about ourselves); and while it is equally far from true to say that plays by contemporary authors about (say) biblical characters cannot be religious plays for contemporary audiences (Gh  on's *The Way of the Cross* is about ourselves), it certainly is true to say, as Yeats did, that dramatists, deliberately religious or no, 'must create once more the pure work' by treating of 'those things that are permanent in the soul of the world, the great passions that trouble all'. An audience needs to have built for it a bridge by means of which it can cross the footlights and enter into the lives of the play's characters. Where this bridge is lacking the play is merely 'high-brow', or of 'detached intellectual opinion', as the dictionary defines that epithet. *Hamlet* is a play for all of us, and never 'high-brow', for the simple reason that it is an expression of 'the great passions that trouble all'. This explains why certain dramas 'live' far beyond the time in which they were written, and continue to appeal to audiences the outward circumstances of whose lives are very different from those of the audiences which first saw the plays acted; such are 'pure works' in the sense of expressing 'those things that are permanent in the soul of the world'; they are in a very exact sense immortal, for their own souls (or content) belong to eternity, and in such plays eternal values persist, however surely their bodies (or the plots, the theatrical conventions, the language they use) become things of the past. The soul of art is indestructible. While the bodies of certain works of art are long-lived, even these must fall victims to time at last and disappear. Yet the truth they have symbolized cannot disappear while new generations of artists arise to mediate it, making new symbols for old, new incarnations of the unchanging.

The human creature is still by nature religious, even at this time, when the surface of our lives seems to show less concern with eternal values than it has done for many centuries; we remain *in potentia* the sons of God and stamped with His image. It is probably the very fact that eternal values have little or no expression in terms of daily life which affords both the reason why dramatists are turning to the religious play, and the reason why, to the surprise of the cynical or despairing, audiences are eager to respond to such plays. It is not really surprising that men and women should 'hunger and thirst after righteousness' as they contemplate what F. O. Matthiessen called 'the grave and menacing future into which we are all walking'. Once it is understood that the heart of religion is the mystery of the death and rebirth of the hero-god within the individual soul, and of its consequent ability to draw strength from the eternal world for the redemption of the temporal world; once it is understood that religion's function is to unite these two worlds by bringing the ideal into operation within the real, then the immediate fascination for contemporary people of any play which gives expression to this essential truth is explained: the realization of this truth is not merely a matter of objective interest; it is a subjective necessity. Ultimately, too, the message borne by the religious dramatist is always one of hope. Only religious experience of the kind we have discussed can lend a stable meaning to an individual's life; and if a man is beset by the fear of suffering to be undergone in a not very distant future, as most

men will be in a crumbling civilization, then a meaning can be found even for his fear: the hero, the protagonist who is the soul of man, journeys to his allegorical death through a valley of the shadow fraught with monstrous dangers, and only beyond this fearful experience can he come to new life as the beloved son in whom his father is well pleased. The climax of all religious drama is the great scene in which transfigured son and eternal father meet and embrace. R. H. WARD

¹ Here I purposely confine myself to plays which I know intimately, either because I have acted in them or because I have produced them. Thus I am able to speak of them from a point of view which is important, that of their effect, both upon those who take part in them, and also upon their audiences.

THE EFFECT OF RELIGIOUS DRAMA ON THE ACTOR

THE EFFECT of religious drama upon the actor partly depends upon the purpose and plan of the production. For instance, imagine that a city decides to put on a religious play to celebrate some centenary or festival. In that case the auditions are probably open to all, and no questions are asked about the beliefs of the cast. It is, alas, all too possible for the play, however deeply Christian in theme, to be treated purely from the historic or theatre point of view, as just one more play. If this is so, though the cast may learn much on the technical side, the play cannot possibly come to life in the true sense, and any religious experience gained by audience or cast would be greatly limited.

If, on the other hand, the producer is not only a Christian but knows how to integrate his faith with the production, this undertaking can be used as a most exciting experience for everyone concerned. The first opportunity comes at the auditions, when he must explain the purpose of the production and the theme of the play. A mixture of honesty and tact is needed here in order to state the Christian reason without antagonizing the genuinely keen actor who may have come along for love of the theatre rather than love of God.

Once having selected his cast, the producer's job is not only to put the show on, but to weld this cross-section of the population into a happy, hard-working group. And what of the actors? Some will be practising Christians, of various denominations, who know how to pray, and their's is a big responsibility. Some are probably nominal Christians, and others of no faith. I believe that Religious Drama can be used by God for bringing these souls to Him. It can also be used by the devil. Much will depend upon that intangible thing—atmosphere—the atmosphere at rehearsals. With a group of this kind it would probably not be wise to start rehearsals with a prayer, at any rate for a time, for some would feel hot-under-the-collar. If this is a city affair, every church should be asked to pray regularly during the two or three months beforehand. This prayer backing is absolutely essential for all productions, but especially if the cast itself does not know much about such things.

Within the cast itself, what will be happening? There will be some dear good

people, with incredibly little artistic ability, who need endless patience, but they are giving everything they've got and loving it. There will probably be one or two who seem to be there by mistake. Their bodies are made of wood and they move about the stage like posts, with mask-like faces void of all expression, whether the scene is concerned with deep suffering or heavenly joy. No one knows why they were ever allowed to remain in the cast—that may be a secret between organizer and producer . . . perhaps it was because of a need for one particular church, factory, or organization to be represented (even by a block), or because of the astounding enthusiasm of said block who turns up on time at every rehearsal and fills gaps of missing people, till, in the end, there he is with his very own line to say in one scene. Then there are the amateur dramatic fiends who have come for love of theatre. If they come from a good group they can be of enormous value to this mixed bag—partly because they will know something of the *discipline* of acting. They will turn up punctually and regularly, and snap into their part and hold it, whereas others waste half the evening getting into the mood. On the other hand they can be a menace if they think they 'know', have got into bad habits of shallow acting, and are really there to take advantage of the opportunity for exhibitionism.

All these people must gradually come under the influence of play and production. As this happens, the corners—so jagged and irritating at first—will gradually rub off, a team spirit will develop, and the play will come to life. But it's not as straightforward as that. Much of what I have said so far applies to any secular play, but with a Christian one the experience for the actor should go far deeper. Once I was producing *The Zeal of Thy House* with Y.M.C.A. men and boys. What did they know about monks and angels? If the producer works on the assumption that no one can play any part till he has lived with 'it' long enough for him to learn to identify himself with that character in any mood—well, just think what that entails for this group working on such a play. True, the cast belonged to one organization, so there was less fitting into each other to be done, but on looking back, I think that one of the greatest values of that experience was the discussion.

There was the shop walker who was playing the Prior—that great man with so many facets to his character, and my friend said he'd never met a man of this kind, who was, in fact, not far from being a saint, with all the strength, wisdom, humour and love that are the hall-marks of sainthood. Nor had this actor read the lives of saints, so he had little to help him; but we tackled it together.

Then those four great archangels who are on the stage almost all through, and for most of the time having to sit (in this production) on beer boxes with no back rest, poised and tranquil, in beautiful heavy robes and more beautiful and heavier wings. They had to learn to believe in angels, not as fairies, but as God's heavenly messengers, who are never out of the sight of the brightness of His Presence, and yet may behold the affairs of stupid men, and by continual intercession lift the hearts of those men and guide them Godward. It demanded a great discipline of those boys, and they gradually came to realize that the power of the play depended upon them and their capacity for quiet concentration throughout every second of the two-and-half-hours. An experience of this kind can and does make the whole difference to the reality of the faith of many an actor.

There is also value in playing the part of a sinner—Judas for instance. The need for studying his character in every mood can bring to the actor a new under-

standing of the truth that there is something of Judas in all of us; that the appalling sin which led to his betrayal of his Master was nothing but an accumulation of the ordinary tiny sins of which he had not repented, but had allowed them to breed and multiply in his heart. Like many of us, Judas was capable of great things—he might have become a powerful leader within the company of the Apostles, if only. . . .

Sometimes a production is arranged by a Council of Christian Churches, when all taking part will be at least nominal Christians of one denomination or another. Then you start on a Christian basis and from there a fellowship can be built up, which may prove a great opportunity for Christian unity.

As an example of an even closer fellowship I will mention an Anglican parish in the north of England where the vicar is the producer, and the drama group consists only of regular communicants. I was surprised to hear that this single-handed priest who, by all accounts, runs a large and lively parish, finds time to produce several plays a year, some secular and some religious. I asked him why he gave so much time to drama, and he replied that he found it one of the most powerful means of making friends with his people. He felt he could get to know them more intimately through a play than in any other way, and so was able to help them in their faith. When doing a biblical play, he always gives each actor some passages to look up which refer to his character. Once, a young man who had not long been with them, was playing the part of St Peter. For some weeks he played without a spark of imagination, and then suddenly his part came to life. The vicar asked him what had happened, and he replied that he had always thought of the apostles as 'holy men' unlike anyone he had ever known or was likely to know—'too good to live', and certainly quite, quite *dead*. But while he was trying to study the life of St Peter and to pray about the part, it dawned upon him that St Peter was very much alive, and was, in fact, helping him to play the part, for they were becoming friends!

The other day I had the privilege of seeing a most beautiful village Passion Play. It was all so simple, so real, and so deeply moving, without ever becoming emotional or sentimental. I was aware at once that here was a praying community, and they were offering this play with everything they had got as a means of worshipping God. Every detail was fully rehearsed and artistically treated, and through it all the Holy Spirit was able to breathe LIFE. I was afterwards told that this play has grown during the years, and has become a vital part of the village and church life. Children grow up from babyhood finding themselves involved in some way or other with the play, and, as at Oberammergau, it is a great honour to be allowed to take part. The whole purpose is to use the play as a medium for deepening the faith of that community, and though it has now become famous over a large area, the church never seeks publicity. Certainly I am sure that here is a happy village.

I hope I have made it clear that to take part in a Christian play is an experience of incalculable value. It sometimes can prove a most revealing and painful one, for it reveals truth—the truth about our faith or the lack of it, its quality and its depth. The actor, or certainly the inexperienced actor—cannot 'get away with' one insincere line. He must clearly understand the point of the play and live his part with sincerity, in order that the truth may be revealed as an experience to be shared by cast and audience together. I remember coaching a gifted and good-looking young man who knew that he had a fine voice, and thought he could enjoy himself in his part. So off he went, pouring it out, till finally I stopped him and

said: 'Yes, but what does it mean?' Silence. . . . Poor young man! He had to let go his conceit, try to think over the meaning of what he was saying, pray it, and so on, through some painful weeks, while the words came stumblingly and haltingly—till at last he was given the power to live the part for the glory of God and not of John Brown.

For the majority of Christians who take part in, say, a biblical play, the experience is not so much a means of learning the story of their Faith as realizing the reality of it. Many of us have listened to the Bible being read in Church, have sung hymns and heard many sermons, and it is so easy to become accustomed to it so that it affects us not at all. But when those same words or the same story come into a play its truth may dawn upon our dull minds as never before.

But what about the devil, who I mentioned before as making use of Religious Drama? Certainly he is there, waiting to slip in by some back door. True to his nature it seems that the greater the spiritual power of a production the greater are his efforts to wreck it. Someone is a little disgruntled at not getting the part he wants; a few are feeling that the producer is demanding too much of their time and loyalty; someone is jealous of another—and so the devil gets his chance. But by the grace of God the evil can be overcome and happiness restored, and only so can the Holy Spirit be free to work through the actors.

I am very sure that if a production is going as it should, be the play gay or grave, rehearsals should be the happiest of affairs. It is quite natural for the cast to go through a dour patch a little before Dress Rehearsals begin, when everyone is tired; but that is nothing more than growing pains and should pass quite quickly to give place to a growing enthusiasm and sense of joy in creation.

Then as the play is performed for so many nights, the cast grows into a single whole, the strains and stresses are forgotten, and people are saying: 'When can we start on another play?'

And so, after perhaps a Service of Thanksgiving, everyone disperses, but they will be different people, for the experience they have shared will have enriched their lives and given them a deeper knowledge of God.

CARINA ROBINS

THE EFFECT OF RELIGIOUS DRAMA ON THE AUDIENCE

IN PRODUCING any play, the objective is to make it *live*—to make it impinge on the audience as an experience in which they have an actual share. One sometimes wonders how much an audience realizes the extremely active part it is to take. There is all the difference in the world between the audience that just sits and waits to be interested, and the audience that comes with the readiness to share an experience. The power of those on the stage to make the play vital can be completely destroyed by inertia on the part of the onlooker. On the other hand, a quick and sympathetic reaction from the front gives a stimulus to those who are playing, and makes the performance live.

In the specialized work of religious drama, the matter of interaction and experience between those on the stage and those in front, has an additional importance, for the religious play is very often an act of worship itself, involving the whole body of people. An example of this can often be seen in the performances of Passion Plays, to which a Church audience nearly always brings a very definite contribution, and a heightened degree of expectancy, in such a season as Holy Week.

But what of an unbelieving audience which cannot, by virtue of its outlook, bring a similar receptivity to that of an audience composed of instructed—or even partly instructed—Christians? The production which takes effect on one, may easily horrify the other. Here the choice of play begins to enter—and here I have to be autobiographical.

After nearly ten years of doing religious drama in Sheffield with the people of Sheffield, and now nearly two years of directing the New Pilgrim Players, this difficulty of finding the play that can impinge on every kind of audience, shows itself increasingly as the root problem. The problem is there to some extent with all kinds of drama, but with Religious Drama it is particularly acute, for there the primary need is to present the Christian Faith in terms that are at once artistically and theologically true, and above all to present it with arresting vitality and not in such a way as to produce a bored consciousness in the audience that it is 'having good done to it'. The Christian Faith should be presented as the most exciting thing in the world, and the play that fails to bring that excitement is doing harm, not good.

One necessity, if we are to achieve this essential of excitement and this vital interaction between audience and stage, is to find a play that has some point of contact with the actual life of those who are to see and hear it. This especially applies in selecting plays for amateur production, for then we are bound to consider what the players can perform with any degree of sincerity; but in some measure it applies to all productions. We cannot expect the workers in an industrial city to have much understanding of the emotions and finesses of *The Cocktail Party*; we *can* expect them to get a lot nearer understanding the Gospel if it is given them in the language and form used by Miss Sayers.

Having known this throughout the time of producing religious drama in Sheffield, and struggled to work on the principle of 'point of contact in life', I saw how readings of such a play as *The Man Born to be King* could indeed exercise a vitalizing and illuminating effect on the young folk of an industrial city who gave them. The language and realism of Miss Sayers met them 'where they were', with the result that they could take part in the play with real depth and sincerity.

So, too, with audiences composed of people living in that particular world; the power of this play to bring alive the truth of the Gospel to them was very evident. This was simply because it was a play which was not separated from life as it is lived in such a city as Sheffield, where stained-glass religion would make no real impact.

With amateurs, the producer of religious drama must be concerned with the effect of the play not only upon those who will witness it, but also upon those who take part in it; and consideration of the players very often has to take priority. When it comes to producing a professional company like the New Pilgrims, however, it is the effect on the audience which has to be of primary importance.

In September 1952 the Religious Drama Society of Great Britain launched this young company with complete awareness of the experimental nature of the venture. One reason for creating the company was the obvious necessity of setting an artistic standard in the production of Religious Drama. Another was the need to encourage the writing of good plays. Above all was the desire to use the clearly evident power of drama as a means of evangelization. The possibilities that lay before the company were endless.

Since I was to be labelled the Director, the scheme was allowed to start rehearsals on the familiar ground of Sheffield. As a national concern it was bound to start touring as soon as it was created.

What sort of audiences were we to anticipate? One which clearly existed in Sheffield belonged to the world of industry—a vast mass of people who were neither instructed theatre-goers nor instructed Christians. And there did not appear to be a single 'small cast' play, which could be considered as 'religious drama' and that had the all-important point of contact with the lives of steel-workers. In this particular situation the length of the play was another problem; for the best time for performance was during the lunch-break, and that meant twenty minutes only. Clearly to make that audience pay the smallest attention in the allotted time meant getting a play specially written, and eventually this was done. Mrs K. M. Baxter had the courage to meet and enter the world of steel-workers, and the script of *T'other Shift* was the result. This one-act play may well be described as a slice out of life, using the language of the workers, showing them to themselves, and in the end simply challenging them to think in Christian terms. The anecdotes and jokes are genuinely those which belong to the world of steel; and the phraseology and swear-words are unashamedly those used by the men themselves. There is consequently an authentic quality about this short play which makes it thoroughly acceptable to an audience of steel-workers.

An audience of another kind, such as one of habitual church-goers, might well flinch from this play, partly because the language is that of the workers and, in some places, consequently strong, and partly because the play is not *obviously* religious. But it is these two facts that make it suitable for performance to audiences in industry; and since that is what it was written for, I would venture to say that it has proved itself to be a work of art—if one can use Zola's definition of a work of art as '*un coin de la nature vu à travers un temperament*'.

The other play which the New Pilgrim Players launched at this time was not wholly new, but again it belongs to the age of community in which we live. This was R. H. Ward's *Holy Family*. The audiences to which this was played were of a considerably more church-going type. It seemed that this production was an

illumination for many who could not have analysed much of the poetry, but who could live and share the experience of the performance, because the subject matter was a 'familiar story told in an unfamiliar way'.

As time has gone on, the evidence has increased that good plays which vitalize the Truth of the Christian Faith in the world we now live in are few and far between. Moreover, the appeal of those that exist is directed mainly to Christian people. And the audiences to which the New Pilgrim Players would like to play are not simply those composed of already convinced Christians—happy though such performances very often are.

After one Lenten season had seen us with Ghéon's *Way of the Cross* as our sole Passion Play, a second spring approached. Were we to continue to produce only such plays about the Cross as we knew had great value to move *Church* audiences? What about the people outside the Church, for whom the traditional form could hold so little meaning?

I found myself longing for the same play in terms of the world we live in—and vituperating in a letter about the frustration of not experiencing a series of miracles which would provide it. These fulminations were passed on to the Rev. Philip Turner, working in a parish in Leeds. He too had been champing on similar lines, and the result was that the piece of my letter which reached him drove him to write *Christ in the Concrete City*. This was a script which as it came into existence excited and alarmed me as a producer. The question of effect on audiences was one reason—though the problem of production was another. It seemed to hold considerable risk of shocking the sort of audiences that attended *Holy Family*, but it also held enormous possibilities of arresting the attention of those that were not regular church-goers.

In technique of writing, the play follows to a certain extent the idea of a chorus—as in *Holy Family*. In its pattern and story it follows to a larger extent Ghéon's *Way of the Cross*. In technique of production (for it has now been played for some time) it has something of a poster crudity in aspect, and a suggestion of revue. But the Christian conviction underlying the script gives it power to relate the story of the Passion to the world we are now in.

One instance of how the play applies the facts of Christian history to the present day, is the scene at Gethsemane. The three men of the chorus on a higher platform than the women and separated from them, are the only visible figures, and they are lit by a single ray of moonlight from off-stage. They play the three disciples—watching, not understanding, weighed down by sleep, and longing to escape from something beyond their comprehension. This is timed slowly, and runs thus:

MAN 2: 'Wait here while I go and pray.'—Why does He tell us to wait? Is there nothing to do but wait?

MAN 3: No, nothing. How suddenly this agony has come upon Him. Its the valley of the shadow of death, a horror we can't begin to understand.

MAN 1: 'Watch and pray that you do not enter into temptation.'—Those were His instructions. Watching is hard work when you do not know what you are watching for.

MAN 2: Praying is hard work when you do not know what you are praying for.

MAN 1: And cold work, too, here in the darkness.

MAN 3: And in the loneliness. How far away God seems when you are dispirited.

MAN 2: And tired.

MAN 3: And afraid.

(MAN 1 and 2 huddle together. MAN 3 is a little apart.)

NARRATOR: And being in agony, Jesus prays: 'My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me. Nevertheless, not my will, but Yours be done.'

MAN 3: Always that same awful prayer, over and over again. And the sweat gleaming on His brow, and falling like drops of blood. I am afraid.

MAN 1: We desire to escape into sleep.

MAN 2: From the terror:

MAN 3: From the agony:

MAN 1: Which we do not understand.

(All three huddle together.)

NARRATOR. And yet again, being in agony, He prostrates Himself and prays: 'Father if this cup cannot pass without my drinking it, Thy will be done.'

MAN 1: We desire to escape into sleep.

MAN 2: Because we are caught up in that which is greater than ourselves.

Then the moonlight slowly dims, and a sudden spot-light picks up the two women who are placed in conventional attitudes on a lower level of staging. Without moving, and with enamelled expressions they speak these lines:

WOMAN 2: When the Vicar calls at our house, we invite him in.

WOMAN 1: Hoping he will not see the emptiness where our smile does not fit nor hear the sound of our escaping husbands.

WOMAN 2: We sit on the edge of chairs in the front room and talk elaborately of the weather.

WOMAN 1: And of our families, and the political situation.

WOMAN 2: And of the weather; how hot it is for the time of the year.

WOMAN 1: Or, for the time of the year, how cold.

WOMAN 2: Building a wall of the banal, lest he should be so indiscreet as to mention our souls.

WOMAN 1: We desire to escape from the embarrassment.

WOMAN 2: From the fear of discussing that which we do not wish to understand.

Then, at this point, a generalized lighting comes up again, and the two groups become a unit which carries the action forward in chorus technique.

The effect of this on an audience is either an experience that goes deep, or a sense of revulsion. People who have already seen *Holy Family* have very often felt disappointed in the new play, because its beauty is not so great, and someone well acquainted with Ghéon's *Way of the Cross* has expressed much the same disappointment. Others (from church-going audiences) have found themselves too battered—the sudden switching from the historical Passion to what it means in terms of today has been too violent for them.

As against this, there have been such comments as: 'I only hope some of the points hit others as hard as they hit me.' (This was from what one can best describe as a 'good Pagan'.) And time and time again there has come the assurance from the minister who is struggling against everyday conditions that this play is exactly what is wanted. Above all there have been occasions such as one in Bradford on Good Friday, when some thousand folk witnessed a performance which left no doubt of the immensely strong impact which was being made.

The very fact that this play produces strong reactions assures one of its value. The shock is the shock of violent challenge, and the challenge is based on sound theology. If the aim of religious drama is 'to bring alive' the Gospel, this is probably the right result; since conflict means life, and the strictly pietistic play so often means death.

PAMELA KEILY

THE VALUE OF RELIGIOUS DRAMA TO THE METHODIST CHURCH

IT WAS not until the Bristol Conference of 1948 that the Methodist Church, officially, made reference to religious drama. A committee was appointed, of course. Its terms of reference are worth quoting: 'In view of the increased use of drama and its value and dangers in the life and witness of the Church, the Conference refers the subject to the following Committee which shall consider the place of religious drama in the work of the Church.' (*Minutes* (1948), p.48.)

In appointing the Committee on Religious Drama, Conference was acknowledging the very considerable growth of interest in religious drama in the Church over many years. The Epworth Press already had a fairly extensive Catalogue of Religious Plays and the demand for them had grown year by year. The Missionary Society, too, had issued a number of plays and the Youth Department, since 1944, had been publishing regularly in *Youth* drama articles which both reviewed new plays and gave advice on various aspects of production.

The work of the Committee in its short history since 1948 is worth mentioning. Hampered as it has been all along by lack of money, and only able to carry on at all by generous gifts, it has succeeded in advising, through post and by lectures, on the right choice of play and the countless other points which come up in drama work in local churches. It has organized a number of very successful drama schools where producers and actors have been able to meet for practical work. It has further published, through The Epworth Press, a *Catalogue of Recommended Religious Plays* which has been a useful guide to many drama groups. Two years ago, under its direction, The Methodist Drama Association was formed. Drama groups in our Church were invited to become members for a nominal annual fee of 5s. minimum and such members have been issued with a *Quarterly Bulletin* which contains full details of most new plays and other useful information. Membership of this Association is steadily growing but many drama groups do not yet know of its existence, despite regular publicity.

In all its work, the Committee on Religious Drama has sought to carry out the terms of reference given at the 1948 Conference and has been at all times aware both of the value and the danger of drama in the Church.

Warnings have been constantly sounded against wasting time on drama unworthy of the Church and also against overmuch time being spent on any drama to the detriment of the spiritual life of the local Church.

It is recognized that drama has its place, and a most valuable place, in the life of the Church, but no drama group should, by its own over-activity, rob the local church community of what ought to be given to other work. If over-enthusiasm for drama robs the Sunday-school of needed teachers, or weakens meetings for Christian Fellowship, something is wrong.

Further, the Committee is constantly stressing the dangers of wasted time and effort on plays not worth producing. Unfortunately there are far too many of these plays; some of them are poor plays by any standard, and others, though technically good, are unsuitable because of their content, and contain situations and dialogue quite out of keeping with Christian behaviour.

Although the Committee is labelled 'a religious drama committee', it has been found quite impossible to confine its activities solely to religious drama. Indeed, to decide what is strictly religious and what is secular is a task no wise person would essay to do. There are biblical plays whose religious content is almost non-existent and, on the other side, works generally regarded as secular which have a most inspiring message.

Everyone who is seriously interested in the welfare of drama in our Church is happy to know that Conference has this subject constantly under review through its Committee, and it can be fully established that the standard of dramatic expression in Methodism is slowly rising. This is obvious to anyone who critically examines the productions at some of our better-class Methodist drama festivals which are held year by year.

Gilbert Shaw, in a valuable preface to Freda Collins's moving passion play, *Redemption*, concludes with the wise sentence: 'The end of religious drama is not itself, but the glory of God, to whom be the praise, now and for ever.' If one is looking for the chief value of religious drama, it is this. The end is never itself, but the glory of God. This must be always kept steadily before all who have any part in it.

Among the values that contribute to this end is the fact that drama, in itself, is creative; and since it demands team work, this creative element must be realized by every member of the team. No drama ever successfully completes itself until it has reached its audience, and from the first moment when the initial inspiration of the playwright is first put down on paper, to that last moment when an audience goes home after the final curtain to ponder on its experience, there must be a vast amount of creative team work.

The producer takes the script and studies it, not only that he may tell his cast how he wants it acted, or his technicians how he wants it lighted and set and costumed, but, even more, that he may feel deeply into the real intention of the author. His production will always remain faithful to the intention of the author, but it will also bear his own stamp, because in his own measure he also is a creator.

The actor, if he really wants to act and not just recite lines, will seek to understand his part, so that he ceases to be the Sunday-school secretary or the Youth Club leader and becomes, instead, what the author wishes him to be. But this again must be creative.

All such dramatic expression demands a technique which must be learned, and discipline must be exerted. But let such technique, valuable though it may be, become an end in itself, so that what matters is the production and not the glory of God, and something irreparable is lost. To stress this, however, does not mean that we must lightly pass over the value of any serious training in dramatic expression; for in addition to the opportunities already mentioned for creative work in a team, any kind of drama work gives to those taking part many advantages.

Actors learn to express themselves as they create their parts, though, paradoxically, they do it by getting outside themselves. Not a few preachers have first learned how to speak and how to lose self-consciousness by early stage-work. Poise, stability, the art of moving gracefully and the eradication of irritating gestures, are all learned as acting experience grows. Self-discipline, always a virtue, is most necessary in an actor, for if he would be successful he must never over-stress himself at the expense of the team.

So also those who have no desire to act find expression for their gifts as back-stage members of the team. The boy who is good at making things becomes a valuable scenery man; another uses his natural bent to paint the sets; a third who likes tinkering about with electric gadgets becomes the stage lighting expert, and the young lady who is good at sewing is appointed wardrobe mistress. All these find that drama gives them the opportunity to be useful in the service of the Church.

But for us, thinking as we are of the special value of religious drama, all these, although they are not to be ignored, are incidentals. For religious drama, if it is true to itself, must be propaganda. It must be evangelism in the highest sense. If we go back to the word's Greek root, we find that 'drama' is 'something done'; and religious drama is 'something done to the glory of God', that God's name may be praised and His nature and His works shown forth to mankind. It is the showing forth of the Good News, of the Gospel, that men may see and hear and believe and be saved.

Preachers may write a thousand sermons and still not exhaust the approaches to the Gospel, and religious drama has a similar diversity. It may follow the pattern of the original miracle play and dramatize something from the Bible or it may lean toward the morality play either in traditional or modern form. But whatever form it takes, its test must be that it puts forth the Good News, the Gospel.

In 1948 a biblical play ran successfully in the West End. Its authors, two Americans, set out to paint, with some sincerity and real dramatic skill, the family of Our Lord. The play, *Family Portrait*, probably owed much of its success to most sensitive acting by Fay Compton as Mary, the widow of Joseph, the carpenter of Nazareth. The production most faithfully portrayed the Palestinian scene and we had great hopes, in the early stages, that this was going to be the kind of Christian drama we had been waiting for. But how the last act disappointed us! Jesus had been dead some years and His mother asked her youngest child to call his new-born infant Jesus, so that her Eldest should not be forgotten—*forgotten*, when at that very time, in Thessalonica, Jason and his friends were being hauled before the rulers with the cry: 'These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.' There was no mention of the fact of the Resurrection and we learnt that throughout the last part of His ministry Jesus had but one message—that we should be kind to one another—and His unhappy mother wanted to know

why anyone should wish to kill Him for that. You do not cover the ethical teaching of Jesus by the adjective 'kind'. Nor are you playing fair with facts if you ignore entirely our Lord's Messianic claims and the Resurrection—the centre of our Faith.

Plays such as these, and there are others, however well written technically and however well presented, can never be classed as Christian drama.

Since it is therefore obvious that the value of religious drama to us depends, in the first place, on our material, it is well to consider what tests we ought to make on the plays we intend to use. I recall that some years ago Kay Baxter, of the Religious Drama Society, issued a list of standards by which the R.D.S. judged manuscripts sent for reading and comment.

The list was so searching that it is worth repeating here. We need hardly look farther for a better guide ourselves.

1. Does this play speak of God's ways with men?
2. Does it speak clearly, out of deep conviction, or muddledly out of convictions insufficiently tested?
3. Does it add to the story already available in other forms—or is it just a rehash?
4. Does it speak in the language of the people for, or about, whom it is ostensibly written?
5. Is it a play that depends wholly on production, or is it one where the printed word really is a safe guide to those who might use it?
6. Has it qualities of devotion or of beauty, or fresh interpretation, that make all the foregoing questions irrelevant?
7. Is it a play?

These standards speak for themselves and need little elaboration. We have already agreed to have nothing to do with religious plays that are not religious and it stands to reason that we want plays written with real conviction.

It will not hurt anyone to plead yet again for Christian plays written in the language of the people, for we are plagued with writers who have never learned the art of writing dialogue in straight-forward, honest-to-goodness, idiomatic English.

Nothing is more irritating than to find a play with dialogue which attempts to copy the dignity of the Authorized Version and, of course, fails to do so. In any case it is false writing. New Testament characters spoke the ordinary fast-flowing, easy, natural, idiomatic verbal expression of their times. Why then stifle a New Testament play with a dialogue spattered with archaisms?

It is further worth while to ask whether the play we have in mind can be produced within the limitations of the average Methodist church or hall. Many amateur writers have no conception of the limitations of the stage. They submit a work which demands ten changes of scenery in the space of ninety minutes, and present the harassed producer with problems which could hardly be solved with a revolving stage in a modern theatre. Or they present such advanced ideas that no producer could ever fully understand them, let alone convey them through his actors to an audience.

Nor must we ever overlook the last standard given above. We must make certain that the work we are about to produce is, indeed, a play. This would seem a point too obvious, but for the distressing fact that so many self-styled religious plays are not plays at all. A play is a definite form of literary art and it has rules which must be followed. Such points as plot, characters, dialogue, and (what we call)

intensity curve must be found in any sound dramatic form. There must be conflict, for drama is never a solo effort. In religious drama this conflict will be between Good and Evil, with both strongly drawn and, of course, with Good triumphant in the end.

One further test needs to be applied in our search for material and, for me, it is the most searching test of all. Will this play, with its message, get across to the audience? Such an important factor must be grappled with as we seek to plan any production. Here Christian Drama must bear the same test that the preacher must put to his message. For however much work we put into our sermon, and however polished and well delivered the final effort may be, if our congregation goes away not knowing what it has been about, we have failed. A sermon is never complete until the congregation has taken something from it. This, surely, must be true also of Christian Drama. There have been, and still are, religious plays which leave an audience bewildered, not knowing what they were about. I have stated earlier that the creative effort of any drama is never completed until it has got across to the audience. This applies with more force than ever to Christian Drama.

In a convincing article in *Christian Drama* (July 1947) F. N. Davey brings home this point with force. Answering an oft-repeated statement that there is no essential difference between religious drama and any other sort of drama, because all art, including drama, is essentially religious, he makes a real and vital distinction between 'religious' and 'Christian' drama. (With this we would emphatically agree.)

He goes on to point out that it is desirable for great painters to work on posters so that posters reveal their art, but that such posters fail if, despite being works of supreme artistic skill, they do not increase the sale of the commodities they sell. In other words, they fail to justify themselves if their propaganda value is non-existent.

So the value of Christian drama lies, not in its aesthetic appeal, though this must not be despised, but in its propaganda, or, if you prefer the term, its evangelical content—its ability to win people for Jesus Christ.

C. S. Lewis thus stressed the difference between the vaguely 'religious' and the 'Christian' in *Miracles*—'We who defend Christianity find ourselves constantly opposed not by the irreligion of our hearers but by their religion. Speak about beauty, truth, and goodness or about a God who is simply the indwelling principle of these three . . . speak about a common mind of which we all are parts, a pool of generalized spirituality to which we can all flow, and you will command friendly interest. But the temperature drops as soon as you mention a God who has purpose and performs particular actions . . . a concrete, choosing, commanding, prohibiting God with a determinate character.'

We have far too much 'religious' drama and too little that is 'Christian'. And, as Hugh Ross Williamson has wisely said: 'The Christian dramatist's aim is not, cannot be, merely *catharsis*, but *catharsis* in terms of *conversion* . . . and is not the one and only test of a play's success not how well it is acted, nor how many people come to it, but how many of the audience come back, because of seeing it, to the ordinary life and services of the Church? It is not the number at the performance that matters, but the number next morning at Holy Communion'—*Christian Drama* (July 1950). Thus speaks an Anglican priest, but every Methodist minister would subscribe whole-heartedly to such a statement.

In assessing the various specific values of Christian drama to our Church, we have pointed out its importance as a means of self-expression, of team-work and of real Christian fellowship; and we have not forgotten how often participation in a Christian play has been a means of grace to the actors, and how many there be who have come to a fuller Christian experience through such work. But we state emphatically that the supreme value of Christian drama to us is as a means of evangelism. To lose sight of this one ultimate goal is fatal. We may as well spare all the effort of play production and find some other avenue more worthy.

It is when we realize this that we take stock of the feeble efforts we so often make to produce our drama and feel thoroughly ashamed. Because, and only because, our Christian drama has this high ultimate aim, no pains must be spared, no effort lessened, to see that what we present is worthy of our aim.

We must choose good material to work on—which means a good play, sound in its Christian teaching, and sound, too, in its play-writing technique. Having found this—and what an effort it so often is—we must then endeavour to give our material a production worthy of it. There is no excuse for an unworthy one. The producer should learn all that is possible about the art, and there are many ways of doing that in these days.

The actors, too, must give their best. Even if the best actors are born, not made, it is possible, by careful study and hard work, for the average person to make a worthy performance. Some people cannot act and never will, and their place is not on the stage at all, but behind, helping in back-stage work. Such people may be devout in the extreme, but devotion of itself does not guarantee a part in every play. As Charles Williams says in *Judgement at Chelmsford*: 'If piety can't act, Father, piety should not be in a play.'

Let us set a very high standard for ourselves rather than be content with something less because of our deficiencies. This does not mean we must tackle only difficult plays. Some of the simplest plays, well within the scope of any conscientious drama group, are the most Christian.

It has been stressed so often as to become a commonplace saying, that nothing but the best is good enough for Almighty God, and we know in our hearts how true it is. In our Christian service, our worship, our music, our art, our architecture—and our drama—we have no room for a second best. But if it is the best, offered with care and devotion, we shall quickly discover the value of Christian drama to our Church. For people who come to see and hear will not only see and hear, but will turn again and be saved.

CYRIL J. THOMAS

THE CHRONOLOGY OF ACTS AND EPISTLES

THE OBJECT of this article is to indicate a new line of approach to the chronology of the apostolic age. It is not claimed that all the problems connected with this complicated question will be solved, but it is hoped to dispel some radical misconceptions and to establish some fixed points. The systems of dating hitherto adopted are all vitiated by the same fundamental defect. They rely exclusively on Acts for their framework and disregard or side-track the more cogent evidence of the Pauline Epistles. Yet the Epistles are the work of a principal actor in the relevant scenes, whereas Acts is a later compilation made by an editor who transcribed his copy without necessarily preserving the correct order of events or properly correlating incidents taken from different sources. It is futile to attempt to fit the facts of the Epistles in to the texture of Acts. The only rational procedure is to see how the materials of Acts can be fitted in to the outline, sketchy though it may be, furnished by the information contained in the Epistles.

This plan does not entail a revolutionary attitude toward the New Testament writings. No one doubts that Acts was composed by the same author as the Third Gospel, and Luke in his preface to the latter practically says that he is drawing on pre-existing documents. Scholars have worked out within narrow limits what these documents were, and one of them was the Gospel of Mark, which also served as a foundation for Matthew. The most cursory study of the three Gospels suffices to prove that, while Matthew and Luke copied large portions of Mark with little alteration of the substance, they had no compunction about taking extensive liberties with the arrangement of his data, or about transposing anecdotes to totally different settings. There is thus every possibility that Luke did the same thing in Acts. As may be seen from any modern commentary, currency has already been given to several theories designed to unravel parts of the sources of Acts, and to rectify errors arising from lack of discrimination in their use. It is widely accepted that the first five chapters are an amalgam of two interlocking narratives covering much the same ground and so producing repetitions (e.g. the twofold arraignment of the apostles before the Sanhedrim, the redundant statements about the community of goods, and so on). Another well-supported hypothesis is that the visits of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem related in the eleventh and fifteenth chapters are derived from two separate sources describing what was in reality the same journey, but stressing different aspects of it. Finally the passages written in the first person, the 'we' sections, are believed by many authorities to be of different origin from the rest of Acts. The first of these theories will not concern us directly, since it deals with events falling outside the period on which light is thrown by the Epistles, but we shall have more to say about the two others in due course.

In order to begin our investigation at a point where the Epistles give us the most decisive assistance, we will first consider the subject of Paul's successive journeys to Jerusalem. The apostle himself asserts very emphatically (Gal 1.18) that subsequently to his conversion he did not go to Jerusalem for three years, and that his next visit did not take place until after the lapse of a further fourteen years. Few passages have caused more embarrassment to critics than this one, and writers who ought to know better have toyed with the idea of substituting 'four years' for 'fourteen years', in defiance of the unanimous MS evidence and in contempt of Paul's own reasoning. His whole argument is that he had a long career of apostolic

labours behind him without interference from, or dependence on, the leaders of the Church in Jerusalem. Nothing in his words suggests that he looked upon these fourteen years as a vacuum in his life, yet even commentators who acquiesce in the figure are obsessed by the notion that the period must be treated as a blank for which a corresponding blank has to be located in Acts. It is extremely improbable that a man of Paul's temperament, having once reached the conviction that his mission in life was to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles, should wait all that time before giving effect to it. For anyone reading the Epistle with a mind free from the prepossessions engendered by Acts the obvious deduction, both from the nature of the case and from the tone of Paul's language, is that the fourteen years represent the period during which the bulk of his missionary work was done. Corroboration of this is not far to seek.

There is one respect in which Paul's figures may be legitimately modified. In computing the interval between two events, it was a common practice to count fractions of a calendar year, at each end of the cycle, as if they were completed twelve-month units. Thus in this case 'fourteen years' would in all likelihood mean twelve full January-to-December years, plus two spans of a few months each, making in all about thirteen years or even somewhat less, according to our own method of reckoning. On a similar principle weeks are, in many modern languages, deemed to consist of eight days, and fortnights of fifteen days. Hence it can be tentatively assumed that the time which elapsed between Paul's conversion and his second journey to Jerusalem, defined by him as comprising an aggregate of 'three years' plus 'fourteen years', amounted in all to approximately fifteen years. Now in the second Corinthian Epistle he recalls with intense emotion a sublime experience which he had undergone fourteen years earlier, when he had been caught up into Paradise and transported into the third heaven (2 Co 12^{as}). There was only one thing which could have left so profound an impression on his soul: the vision which had brought him face to face with his Lord and which had ensured his conversion.

Let us see in what circumstances this was written. It is generally conceded that it forms part of a passage belonging to a separate letter sent off some time before the main body of the Epistle, but incorporated in it by the archivist. It betrays a mood of despondency caused by the continued dissensions at Corinth, whereas the opening chapters show that at the time of writing harmony had been restored, and that Paul had been gladdened by the news when meeting Titus on his arrival in Macedonia. The first and more lugubrious letter was therefore despatched while he was still in Asia. He was then planning a journey to Jerusalem, but intended on the way to make a halt in Troas where he saw prospects of doing some good work, to travel by easy stages through Macedonia, and finally to make a longish stay in Corinth before sailing for the Levant. He would eventually arrive in Jerusalem little less than a year after the letter alluding to his vision, that is to say about fifteen years after his conversion. In other words the visit to Jerusalem contemplated in the Corinthian Epistles is the same one as the second visit referred to in Galatians. Further proof of this is afforded by the identity of his travelling companions. According to the second Corinthian Epistle Titus was with him when he was about to set out from Macedonia, and according to Galatians this same Titus was with him on the second trip to Jerusalem. In writing to Corinth, Paul mentions Barnabas in terms which show that the two were still partners, though

not apparently together at the time. Galatians shows that, wherever they rejoined each other, they were associated during the second Jerusalem visit, but were soon afterwards in opposite camps. Inevitably the Corinthian Epistles, and consequently the major missionary tours, preceded the second journey to Jerusalem.

The date of this journey can be determined by an analysis of the narrative of Acts in relation to Paul's visits to Corinth. When writing 2 Corinthians Paul had been to Corinth twice, and was on his way there a third time. His second stay in the city, a brief, distressing, and abortive one, clearly came after the date of 1 Corinthians. Acts on the other hand only mentions one sojourn in Corinth, and it is usually supposed that the second call there was entirely ignored. There is, however, a simple alternative interpretation: Acts has fused together into a single account materials belonging to two different visits and postulating, if closely scrutinized, two contradictory situations. There comes firstly a period of steady and uneventful growth during which for a year and a half the Church gained adherents among Jews and Greeks. Then all at once with the uproar in Gallio's court we are plunged into an atmosphere of strife which is quite incomprehensible. The whole story of the Corinthian mission abounds in incongruities. After Paul had been preaching week after week for an appreciable time without molestation he was suddenly, for no discernible reason, assured in a vision that he need not be afraid, and was urged to speak freely as though he had not hitherto been doing so (Ac 19.1-10). The promise of divine support presupposes that some specific ordeal lay immediately ahead, yet the next verse states prosaically that things went on as before for eighteen months without incident. Then along came the court case which was plainly the contingency foreshadowed in the dream. The severance of the trial from the exhortation by a verse envisaging a wholly divergent set of conditions proves beyond doubt that Luke is mixing elements of disparate origin. An additional sign of this is that Paul lived in two different houses. He had no cause to change his address, for he cannot have wished, as is averred by Acts, to get away from the Jews. His new home was next door to the Synagogue, and his congregation remained a mixed one of Jews and Greeks (1 Co 14). His intimacy with his first hosts Aquila and Priscilla continued unbroken, but his choice of a fresh abode is self-explanatory if it occurred during the second visit, when this couple had migrated to Ephesus.

Again, there are two different Synagogue chiefs, of whom the first, Crispus, is illogically represented as being converted after Paul had turned away from the Jews. The second one, Sosthenes, was a co-signatory of the first Epistle. Evidently he had gone to Ephesus to solicit Paul's help in litigation with which he was threatened for, though Luke names Paul as the defendant in Gallio's court, the sequel shows that it was Sosthenes whom the prosecutors were attacking. This alone proves that Paul was not domiciled in Corinth when the charge was formulated, but attended the court as an advocate, though as it happened his eloquence was not needed. The circumstances of his departure are equally anomalous. If he had been resident in Corinth for the past year and a half, he can have had no pressing business elsewhere, yet it seems that, after persevering so long while his position was unchallenged, he abruptly left the city just as an embroilment menaced the stability of the Church. The very phrase in which his farewell is recorded strikes a peculiar note, for after the length of his stay has already been set down in round figures, it sounds very flat to say that he remained a further

number of days. A final abnormality arises from the reference to Timothy. According to Acts he had, with Silas, rejoined Paul soon after his first arrival in Corinth, and 2 Corinthians confirms that they had all been there together. Yet in the first Epistle Paul writes of Timothy as a young man not personally known to his correspondents, and a comparatively recent recruit whom they are asked to welcome if he arrives. It was not until Paul's second trip to Corinth that Timothy was there with him, and his name could not be inserted where it is unless the two visits were jumbled together.

Everything therefore goes to show that the Gallio affair belonged to a flying visit paid from Ephesus not long before the termination of Paul's mission there, i.e. some three years after he had left Corinth. Its proper place in Acts would be after 19^{ss}, before the tumult about 'Diana of the Ephesians'. This would allow for the rise of the factions enumerated in 1 Co 1^{ss}, and bring Acts into line with the Epistle concerning the activities of Apollos.

The significance of this is that the date of Gallio's governorship is known. He was proconsul of Achaia in A.D. 52, and the only difficulty is that, though these magistrates were appointed for twelve months (very exceptionally for longer), the tenure of office did not coincide with the calendar year, but extended roughly from midsummer to midsummer. Gallio's health, as we learn from his brother Seneca, was not good and the Greek climate disagreed with him, so it is improbable that he stayed beyond the usual term. The epigraphical evidence favours the view that A.D. 52 was the year in which his administration ended, which means that he took up his duties about June A.D. 51, and the language of Acts strongly suggests that the province had recently changed hands when the assault on Sosthenes took place. The first Corinthian Epistle, written some time before a Whitsuntide, thus falls in the early part of A.D. 51. Paul's second visit to Corinth followed in the summer of the same year, and his third visit, the one announced as imminent in 2 Corinthians, in the winter of A.D. 51-2. Presumably he sailed from there when long-distance navigation was re-opened after its annual suspension during the bad weather, and arrived in Jerusalem for the second time since his conversion in the early summer of A.D. 52. This automatically puts his conversion in A.D. 37 and his first journey to Jerusalem in A.D. 39, both of which dates are entirely suitable from all points of view.

Let us next see whether our ideas of the general structure of Acts admit of a little more clarification. After his account of the conversion Luke tells of Paul's first return to Jerusalem in its correct place (9^{ss}). Following this he went home to Tarsus (9^{ss}) where he dwelt until he was sought out by Barnabas (11^{ss}), and the two then spent a whole year in Antioch. So far Acts tallies with Galatians, where Paul says that on leaving Jerusalem he withdrew to Syria and Cilicia. Then the discrepancy begins. After what looks from Acts to be only a short delay, Paul and Barnabas are said to have gone back to Jerusalem with funds collected to enable the mother Church to cope with an anticipated famine. Much ink has been spilled in trying to adapt Paul's time-table to this famine, but if his own word is to be taken he cannot have gone to Jerusalem again so soon. The passage is moreover suspect owing to the mention of Agabus in 11^{ss}, for in a much later context (21^{ss}) the prophet is introduced as though making his first appearance on the scene. There was, it is true a famine in Judaea in about A.D. 47, and it is likely enough that some assistance was sent from Antioch. It was perhaps also as a result of the

famine that the collections about which the Corinthian Epistles have so much to say were instituted, and that Paul paid the visit to Antioch which interrupted the Ephesian mission. What probably happened was that Luke's source-writer telescoped all this into a single episode which he confused with Paul's second journey to Jerusalem. Even conservative critics are now inclined to agree that the 'famine relief' journey is a doublet of the one leading up to the 'Apostolic Council' in Chapter 15, but this is only half the truth. Luke has not only duplicated this journey, he has very much antedated it.

It is incontrovertible that in spite of the difference in the report of the proceedings, the 'Apostolic Council' of Acts 15 is identical with the conference of Paul and Barnabas with the 'pillars of the Church' in Galatians. In Acts it ought to follow Chapter 19, and the journey through Macedonia to Greece in 20¹⁻² probably represents, in Luke's source, the initial stages of the second journey to Jerusalem, corresponding with those referred to in 2 Corinthians as just accomplished (Ephesus to Macedonia) or as just impending (Macedonia to Corinth). There is a conspicuous unconformity in the next verse, where Luke switches over from one source to another. It is difficult to see how the Jews of Corinth could prevent Paul from sailing direct to Syria (which it must be assumed he actually did), but allow him to proceed via Macedonia. Conversely it stands out very plainly that Philippi had been designated well in advance as a rendezvous for the travellers on the particular voyage which was to begin there, and which must be distinct from the one which the opening verses of the chapter commemorate. For the events which separated the two journeys, linked here together by an imaginary Jewish plot, we must turn farther back in Luke's narrative.

As testified by Galatians, the compromise reached at the conference in Jerusalem in A.D. 52 was soon violated. Paul and Barnabas had returned to Antioch, to be followed first by Peter and then by emissaries of James the brother of Jesus. The controversy about the observance of the Mosaic Law, which Paul thought had been settled, flared up again and this time ended in a complete rupture. Led by Peter, all the Jewish members of the Church, including Barnabas, withdrew from communion with the Gentile brethren who on Paul's authority refused to comply with the Law. Similar trouble was brewing in Galatia and it was to counteract this that the Epistle was written. It might be expected that Paul would take the first opportunity of renewing personal contact with that province, and if we examine the sequel to the 'Apostolic Council' as told by Acts we find a situation analogous to that portrayed by Galatians. Paul and Barnabas had duly returned to Antioch and though Luke suppresses any explicit reference to the schism which took place there, he does mention the quarrel between these two old friends which was one of its prominent features, though he ascribes it to a false motive (15³¹⁻²). Paul did, moreover, after a tour of Syria and Cilicia, set out for Galatia and traverse the whole province (16¹⁻²) though it was not then, as stated by Acts, that he first met Timothy. He was prevented from preaching in 'Asia' (the district of Ephesus), a prohibition which is not very intelligible unless this journey took place after the events in which, as told by 2 Corinthians 1¹, his life had been in danger there. (He also deliberately avoided Ephesus on the final journey to Jerusalem, and we may surmise that he had been banished from its territory.) Crossing the whole of Asia Minor he reached Troas, where he embarked for Philippi, and it is at this stage that the first extract from the 'we' source occurs. The next one does not come

until Chapter 20, when Paul and his companions left Philippi again. We saw above that the departure from this town was unrelated to the movements preceding it in Acts 20:1-4, and it must therefore be connected with the arrival there in 16:11. It is in any case obvious that the 'we' story was originally a consecutive one, not a series of disjointed fragments. It results from this that Luke has transposed not only his report of the congress in Jerusalem of A.D. 52, but also its immediate consequences: the quarrel between Paul and Barnabas which is all he tells us of the wider schism, the tour of Asia Minor, and the inauguration of the 'we' narrative.

It is now possible to reconstruct, in broad outline, the chronology of our period. After leaving Jerusalem in A.D. 39, Paul withdrew for a spell to Cilicia and Syria. One year of this time was spent in Antioch before he went to Cyprus with Barnabas. Assuming that something like another year had been taken up in Cilicia, the Cyprus tour would fall in A.D. 41 or 42, and may again have lasted a year or so. In the absence of definite evidence these estimates are hypothetical, but they are confirmed by a synchronism which is too striking to be accidental. Herod Agrippa, who was king of Judaea from A.D. 41 to 44, put to death James the brother of John and had Peter arrested in A.D. 42 or 43 (Acts 12). Peter soon got free, and called on Mark's mother before disappearing from Jerusalem. Mark was not there, for he was in Cyprus with Paul and Barnabas. If he heard this news on returning to the mainland, he had a compelling reason for hastening back home, one to which Paul could take no exception. He is doubly absolved then from responsibility for the quarrel between Paul and Barnabas, though he doubtless sided with his uncle when it befell. Paul indeed still writes of him with warm affection in the 'Captivity' Epistles, which belong to the Ephesus phase.

Between the Cyprus tour and the Jerusalem conference nine or ten years intervened. About the last five and a half of these, say from A.D. 46 to 47 to the middle of 52, are occupied by the events in Corinth and Ephesus, and by protracted travelling. At most four years, from A.D. 42-3 to 46-7, remain to be accounted for, and that is approximately the time needed for the Galatian and Macedonian missions. In particular the three or four weeks allotted by Acts to Macedonia are altogether inadequate. The Church in Thessalonica became a model community, but before it was even self-supporting Paul was there long enough to require assistance twice from Philippi, and clearly he was well enough known in the latter for this help to be sent without demur. The Epistles to both these cities betoken an intimacy not acquired in a few days or weeks. There were other Churches in Macedonia, and Paul had penetrated as far as the confines of Illyria (Ro 15:19). The examples of Asia and Achaia show that a space of two years is a fair average to assign to the establishment of a new provincial organization. With regard to Galatia, reminiscences of the first tour are contained in the stories associated with Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, but Paul probably went much farther afield than this, for in revisiting his foundations he only stopped at the Bithynian frontier. As may be inferred from 2 Corinthians 11:1-6, many of his adventures found no place in Acts, and it is impossible to map out an exact itinerary, but enough has been said to prove that his 'fourteen years' were well filled.

The last journey which was to end in Rome need not detain us long, since our present task is to fix dates, and their historical implications must be dealt with elsewhere. There is no reason to suppose that much time elapsed between the pact of Jerusalem and the renewal of the conflict at Antioch. Peter's secession

may be placed in the autumn of A.D. 52 or the ensuing winter and Paul's resumption of his travels in the spring of A.D. 53. The rest of this year would be taken up by the progress through Asia Minor to Troas and thence to Philippi, where an assembly of delegates from many Churches was convened. At Easter A.D. 54 'we' took ship again for Palestine, arriving before Whitsuntide. In Jerusalem Paul fell foul of the Jewish hierarchy and was for his own safety escorted to Cæsarea by order of the Roman commander. Felix the governor was at this time recalled and his successor Festus decided to send Paul to Rome. The apostle was not, as has been wrongly conjectured from 24¹⁷, confined in Cæsarea for two years. The natural meaning of the verse is that Felix was superseded on the expiry of two years of office, and there is good evidence in Josephus that his procuratorship dated from A.D. 52. Luke's narrative is very circumstantial at this point, and would hardly mention so casually an imprisonment lasting two years. In any event Felix returned to Rome in A.D. 54 since, also according to Josephus, he arrived in time to enjoy the protection of his brother Pallas, who was a minister of Claudius, but soon began to lose influence after Nero's accession in the autumn of A.D. 54.

It is thus all but certain that Paul sailed from Cæsarea in the late summer of A.D. 54 and after many more vicissitudes reached Rome in the spring of A.D. 55. Though technically a prisoner, he was subjected to little or no restraint. During the voyage he did as he pleased, whether on board or at the various landing-places. In Rome he lived for two years under scarcely more than nominal supervision in his own lodging, and there we must leave him.

W. SMITH

IS CHRISTIANITY THE ENEMY OF PROGRESS?

THE OTHER day I attended a public debate between a Methodist minister and the Chairman of a Secularist Society; the subject, proposed by the latter, was: 'That Christianity is the historic enemy of Progress.' No vote was taken; but an impartial observer, judging purely on the evidence brought forward by the two speakers and their respective supporters from the floor, must have concluded that the motion was not only defeated but routed. As a serious display of intelligent criticism of the Faith and the Church, the proposer's speech (and those of his supporters) was an utter failure; if that is the best the secularists can do, the Church has won 'hands down'. The speaker seemed to have read nothing more serious or up-to-date than the popular atheist magazines of sixty years ago, attacking theological and biblical ideas which were *then* sixty years out of date.

But though one came away from the debate feeling very rejoiced, yet one knew all the time that, however little basis there is in fact for the belief in the bad influence of the Church, it is a belief held none the less by a considerable number of people. And seeing that we in the Church meet these people every day of our lives, and from time to time no doubt hear such ideas put forward, it behoves us to be ready with an answer—'to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in us'.

We might do well then to ask ourselves what answer we *can* give if we are challenged—and we *are* challenged every time we hear such attacks made, whether they are addressed personally to us or not. How much truth is there in the allegation? What is there to be said on the other side?

In practice, we find the atheist attacks on two or three simple issues: we always hear about Galileo who was persecuted for holding that the earth moved round the sun; we always hear about the witch-hunting, alleged to be based on the biblical injunction—'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live'; we always hear of the Spanish Inquisition, and of the Church's attack on Darwin's theory of Evolution. Those are hardy perennials—those always crop up—and they are interspersed with whatever flights of imagination any particular speaker fancies.

Now it is no good denying that persecutions did take place (it is noteworthy, by the way, that most of the sins are laid to the charge of the Romanist Church); Galileo *was* compelled to retract and witches *were* hunted; and men and women *were* burnt at the stake, and Darwin *was* virulently attacked.

The strange thing is that, while the Church's enemies thus assail her for opposing 'progress', they forget what 'progress' is. 'Progress' is necessarily something in a state of flux; it is not equivalent to a 'state of perfection' or 'absolute truth'. If there is 'progress', then there is continual change—all in the right direction, of course—and what is wrong or bad at any particular period (because it is now superseded) was once good, and was an advance on what was previously believed. A hymn in our hymn-book contains the lines:

*Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of truth.*
(M.H.B., No. 898)

That is true—but that which is now out of date and bad, once was very up-to-date, and an improvement on anything that had gone before.

Now it is just that which our secularist friends forget. They completely lack any sense of historical perspective; they forget that the leaders and the rank and file of the Church at any time have been, to a considerable extent, children of their age. They judge the beliefs, principles and actions of men hundreds of years ago by our twentieth-century standards—and find them wanting. Of course they are found wanting. And the best secularist standards of behaviour three hundred years ago were found wanting by the Christian standards of a century later, which in turn are out-of-date now. It is sheer idiocy—if not dishonesty—to judge a fifteenth-century Christian by twentieth-century standards.

But all that is said only by way of explanation; it is not intended thereby to justify actions of the Church, such as are frequently pilloried, in situations where the Church should have known better. It must be admitted that there have been serious lapses from a truly Christian standard of faith and practice. In every age, and in this age, there have been men who were 'in' the Church but not 'of' it.

While, however, we are bidden thus to confess our sins, even Christian humility, wide-embracing as it is in its demands, does not require that we confess to sins that we have never committed, or that we ignore the Church's record for good, of which we may be proud. And the enemy will at times make charges he cannot substantiate—let us be on the watch for such, and challenge him to produce his evidence.

But enough of defence; let us carry the war into the enemy's camp. Let us consider those occasions—and they are legion—when the Church, as an institution, or as represented by individual Christians, has been in the forefront of progress. In the debate to which I referred at the outset, the secularist speaker claimed that the Christian religion was responsible for the downfall of the great Greek and Roman civilizations. There was a glorious culture in the last three hundred years before the advent of Christianity, and (so it was claimed) the succeeding thousand years of the 'Dark Ages' were the result of the impact of Christianity on that culture. Now that is a sheer inversion of the facts. Those two civilizations collapsed because of their own inherent rottenness and (in the case of Rome) this was assisted by the onslaught of the Goths in 410. So far from Christianity being the enemy of those cultures, it was Christianity which made life tolerable for the slaves (seventy-five per cent of the population of Greece were slaves), it was Christianity which first opposed the prostitution and obscenity which was a regular part of Greek temple worship—and consequently it was Christianity which raised the level of women in Greece and Rome. Even Paul's apparent hostility to women, his demand that they should take no prominent part in Christian worship, was the result of that protest; they had played such a horrible part in pagan worship that thoughts and memories of those ceremonies would be aroused, were they too soon to play a prominent part in Christian Church-life: it was done to defend them against their old reputation and temptations, to raise their status in Greek society.

This proclamation of liberty to the captives by the Christian Church has been characteristic of its life throughout the ages. It was a Churchman, Archbishop Stephen Langton, who drew up the Magna Carta and so laid the foundation stone of English democracy; it was a Christian, George Fox, who three hundred years ago heralded the present-day detestation of war, and refused to countenance the evil under any circumstances—and in that he was following in the footsteps of the primitive Church which for the first three hundred years of its existence was

entirely pacifist. It was a Christian, William Wilberforce, assisted by the oft-despised 'Clapham Sect' of evangelical Churchmen, who fought over a period of many years the battle for the slaves in the British colonies, and it was our own John Wesley who encouraged Wilberforce in the last letter he ever wrote: 'Go on, in the name of God and in the power of His might, till even American slavery (the vilest that ever saw the sun) shall vanish away before it.' Seventeen years earlier Wesley had attacked the evil in his *Thoughts upon Slavery*, in language that makes our modern propagandist journalism seem anaemic. Wesley of course was a pioneer in many things, in many things a hundred years ahead of his time. He fought the drink traffic, and it has been ever since left to the Christian Church to continue that fight; he set up orphanages (here he was indeed no innovator—but it was a Christian original at Halle, in Germany, that he was copying); he set up schools, and it was the Church alone that for many years still to come concerned itself with popular education. He set up dispensaries that the poor might obtain relief from their sufferings (again a pioneer), and published his *Primitive Physick*, which ran through at least thirty-two editions, and while it contained a number of quaint remedies, many of them were sound common sense, and cheap. He was a pioneer of inexpensive literature—the forerunner, if you like, of the *Everyman Library* and the *World's Classics*. He was one of the first to protest against bribery and the like in parliamentary elections. And that is not the end! All that from a man who in popular reputation was merely a ranting preacher of 'pie in the sky when you die'. He was of course first and foremost an evangelist—and it was because of that that he took up all these other causes; in that fact you have the answer to our question. John Wesley may be regarded as a standing proof that Christianity means progress in every other sphere of life. In any case, even if he had restricted himself to evangelistic preaching, that would have contributed toward progress, as his converts, having come to a new life, now knew that, if God had judged them worthy to die for, they were worthy of something better than they had yet known in this life, and consequently set about to improve their minds and ways of living.

Coming to the nineteenth century, we find this connexion between Christianity and social reform continued. The name of Lord Shaftesbury, an Evangelical Anglican, will be for ever associated with many measures of social progress, measures to ameliorate the conditions of labour in factories and mines, and to prohibit the employment of children and women in unsuitable occupations: industry after industry claimed his attention; no sooner was one reform successful than he set about prosecuting another—mining, lace-making, chimney-sweeping, in these and other industries he—first and foremost a Christian—improved conditions.

Other areas of social progress where it was Christians who took the lead, we have only time to glance at. But let us recall the name of Charles Kingsley, an Anglican minister, who wrote and toiled for the sake of the poor and unfortunate; Elizabeth Fry and John Howard, two Quakers who were the pioneers of prison reform in England and on the Continent (the latter enlisting Wesley's support); Josephine Butler, who investigated the unnameable horrors of the white slave traffic; and humbler, almost unknown, men, who fought and suffered that workmen might have the right to band themselves together in trade unions. One recalls the 'Tolpuddle Martyrs', who were the pioneers in this movement—six Dorset farm labourers, most of whom were Methodist local preachers; and about the same

time (a hundred years ago), when the Chartists were agitating for a truer democracy, the majority of their leaders were Christians, generally Methodists; their meetings were frequently held on Methodist premises, and even hymns from the *Methodist Hymn-book* were sometimes sung there. The Chartist movement was marred by many excesses and much violence—any similar movement always attracts a proportion of roughs who are more concerned with a scrap than with the principles of the movement—but none the less it aimed at progress in the political sphere, and Christians were prominent in the struggle.

If the acquisition of a written language is a sign of progress, then the Church can claim first place among those who have contributed to the expansion of civilization. In the first centuries of the Christian era, as in the last century or so, nation after nation has gained a written language because Christianity went there. A couple of examples will suffice. Bishop Ulfilas took the Gospel to Germany in the fourth century and, in order that people might be able to turn to the Scriptures themselves, he invented the Gothic script that the Scriptures might be written down; and about the year 500 the Scriptures were taken to Turkestan—and again a script was invented. To be sure, all those who toiled to invent a written language for these peoples did so with the primary—perhaps even sometimes the sole—intention of enabling them to read the Bible. But once the language was reduced to writing, it could be used for any purpose: letters could be written; state records could be kept; men of an imaginative mind could put down their thoughts that others might enjoy them; the traditional legends could be made safe against loss. If that is not progress, what is? In any case, even if a written language were only utilized for propagating the Scriptures, that itself would be a step forward: for the Scriptures are intended to lead men to Christ, and we have already seen that that leads to improvement in many directions. So closely have the spread of the Gospel and literacy gone hand in hand, that it may be doubted whether a single language has been reduced to writing in the last two thousand years other than by Christian missionaries. That is surely a fact of immense significance.

Mention of the spread of literacy reminds us of the tremendous contribution Christian missions have made to progress among the backward peoples of the world. It is Christianity which relieves them of the fear of evil spirits and witches, Christianity which brings them healing, Christianity which brings them education and sanitation and improved agriculture. The secularist brings them *his* part of Western civilization—gin, gambling, and venereal disease—one can hardly imagine that even our secularist Chairman would regard those as progress, and the work of the missionary as the enemy thereof!

What shall I more say? For time would fail me to tell of the greatest musician of all times, Bach—a devout Lutheran Christian; of Mendel, a pastor who propounded the 'Mendelian' theory of heredity; of Father Schmidt, Romanist priest and leading anthropologist; of William Ewart Gladstone, England's greatest Prime Minister and an eager Christian; of the Rev. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson—otherwise Lewis Carroll!—brilliant mathematician and author of *Alice in Wonderland*, which is far more than a children's story; of Albert Schweitzer, who holds four doctorates and is a Christian missionary in the Congo—it would be easy to multiply names. Other scientists, writers, statesmen, reformers there were who were not Christians, it is true; but enough has been said to show that Christians, instead of being the enemies of progress, have been increasingly in the forefront, in many

cases being the pioneers, bearing the brunt of the fight, and often dying before the fight was won. Einstein's oft-quoted witness is worth repeating, as the testimony of a Jewish agnostic; he lamented the failure of the university world (surely there, if anywhere, we should find liberty upheld and progress forwarded!) to stand up against the tyranny of Hitlerism, and was surprised to find there was more hope in the Church. And, lest any should say that, when Christians were progressive, it was *in spite of* their Christianity, let us again stress that their concern for progress and reform and the improvement of human conditions, was the direct outcome of their Christian faith in Him who came that men 'might have life, and might have it more abundantly'.

O. A. BECKERLEGGE

CHURCH UNION

(NORTH INDIA AND PAKISTAN)

CONVERSATIONS about Church Union have been going on in North India, including what is now Pakistan, since 1924, when the then Wesleyan Methodist Church in North India was invited to consider uniting with the United Church of Northern India (Presbyterian and Congregational), and through its representatives suggested that the time was ripe for an attempt at a wider union. A Round-Table Conference was called, which met some five years later. A considerable number of Churches sent representatives, but the Anglican Communion was represented only by an observer. Little progress was made at that meeting, but the Round-Table Conference and its Continuation Committee met several times. The first real turning-point was in 1937 at Lucknow, when the Churches represented, then reduced to five in number, recognized each other's ministries as ministries of the Word and Sacraments. Other attempts at a smaller union were made, but did not succeed, though useful work was done.

In 1944 the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon passed an epoch-making resolution at the instance of the Rt Revd G. A. Hubback, then Bishop of Assam and later Metropolitan, acknowledging that in division all ministries were defective, as lacking the seal of the Church as a whole. This, together with the agreement in South India, gave fresh vigour to the Round-Table Conference, and in 1951 for the first time a definite Negotiating Committee met, with regularly-appointed delegates from the Churches connected with the Baptist Missionary Society (London), the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon (Anglican), the Methodist Church (British and Australasian Conferences), the Methodist Church in Southern Asia (Episcopal), and the United Church of Northern India. This has now published the second edition of the *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*,¹ in which the plan has been completed, except for certain matters left to the Continuation Committee, and to the Church after union has been inaugurated.

This *Plan of Church Union* owes very much to the South India Scheme, and to the work on Union done in Ceylon, especially to Ceylon's proposal to recognize both infant baptism and the baptism of believers as *alternative* forms of baptism.

The Constitution and the Basis of Union both owe much to these other efforts. It is therefore important to notice the differences from the South-India Scheme, which are of great moment.

(i) It is proposed to unify the ministry of the Church at the inauguration of union. It has been felt that the views of ordination held in the negotiating Churches differ so much from one another that it is theologically unsound, and savours of a frivolous view of ordination, to accept these as equivalent to one another. All suffer from the present divisions of the Church. It is therefore proposed, after the inauguration of the Church and indeed as part of the inaugural services, to have a representative unification of the ministry, at which representatives of the uniting Churches, including for the episcopal Churches at least one Bishop each, should lay hands on the existing Bishops, the presbyters chosen to be Bishops, and an adequate number of presbyters from the uniting Churches and from each diocese of the new Church. There was danger lest this should be a sort of camouflage, but care has been taken so to word the relevant resolutions as to avoid this. Two sentences may be quoted. 'It is not re-ordination'; and 'In particular (the uniting Churches) believe that God will assuredly so answer their prayers that any difference between ministers not hitherto episcopally ordained, and those so ordained will be thus transcended, and that by such transcending of this and other differences, as they are known to God Himself, the united Church will receive from Him a Ministry fully and without exception accredited in the eyes of all its members, and, so far as may be, in the eyes of the Church throughout the world.' These words, and indeed all the resolutions on this subject were unanimously accepted in the Negotiating Committee.

(ii) One outstanding difficulty, never before faced, as far as we know, concerns the two episcopates, Methodist and Anglican, which must be unified, in view of the special responsibility of Bishops in ordination. The first point is that before this takes place, all the existing Bishops and those to be made Bishops will have become ministers of the united Church. Methodist Bishops belong and claim to belong to a presbyteral succession, while Anglican Bishops belong to the historic episcopate, defined as that which is in historic continuity with the early Church. No theological definition of the historic episcopate has been made, nor will such be demanded as an article of belief from any minister or member of the Church after union. It must be remembered that the Anglican Communion itself has no such definition, nor does it make any such demand from its ministers and members.

In considering this difficulty (and in all the negotiations every effort has been made to face facts) there has been much plain speaking; but it has been 'speaking the truth in love'. Under God's guidance, as we believe, the problem appears to have been solved. It would be to expand this article too much to give the details of what has been proposed and accepted; readers must be referred to the *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*. But the approach was first of all to define Bishops by their functions, and it then became clear that the Methodists concerned were consecrated to be Bishops.

(iii) One effect of unifying the ministry at the outset is that there will be no consecration of presbyters *per saltum*, since all will have first of all become ministers of the united Church. This may not be an important point, but is worth mention.

(iv) It has been decided that when changes are proposed in the united Church in matters of 'faith and order', voting shall be by houses; that is, no change shall

be made unless it is acceptable to the laity, the presbyters and the Bishops, voting separately. This carefully worded arrangement was mainly the work of a Presbyterian member of the Committee.

(v) It has been decided that union in organization shall take place from the level of the diocesan councils, which correspond to the Methodist Synods. Local Churches will retain their present organization, and also their modes of worship, until these are changed by the mutual consent of the local Church and higher authority. This should much facilitate the local acceptance of union. All local Churches, whatever their local organization, will find representation in the diocesan councils.

(vi) The Methodist Church in Southern Asia has district superintendents, who assist the Bishops in their pastoral and supervisory work, and the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon has rural deans for the same purpose. The continuance of this organization has been safeguarded.

(vii) There is a clear statement of the desire of the uniting Churches that all existing relations of fellowship and communion with other Churches shall be maintained. Only the desire can be expressed, because fellowship and communion obviously depend upon those other Churches as well as upon the ones that are uniting.

(viii) The priesthood of all believers, which is fundamental in all the negotiating Churches, has been carefully expressed, the wording being mainly taken from the constitution and canons of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon. 'The Church is a "royal priesthood" of believers, all its members have direct access to God, and all the members have their share in the commission and authority of the Church.'

It is impossible in an article to convey the constant sense of spiritual fellowship, and of the presence and guidance of God's Spirit, experienced in the meetings of the Negotiating Committee and of its predecessor, the Round-Table Conference. Obstacles that were apparently insuperable have been overcome. There has been on all hands a will to union, and a determination to let God guide the negotiators. Nothing has been decided by a seriously divided vote, and very few matters indeed have in the end had any votes against them. When minorities existed, matters have been postponed till more investigation and thought was possible. There have been occasional exceptions to this when on some very minor matter one or two only have voted against a resolution; but even such small exceptions have been extremely few.

The Churches have generally sent very weighty and representative delegates. At the last meeting of the Negotiating Committee, there were five Bishops, two of whom were Methodist, several chairmen and ex-chairmen of Methodist Districts, moderators and ex-moderators of the United Church of Northern India, secretaries of the National Christian Council, and principals of colleges. Some of the Indian members have taken a great share in the work. Among outstanding men no longer with us should be mentioned Bishop Azariah, the Revd A. J. Revnell, B. L. Rallia Ram of Lahore, president of the National Christian Council, and Canon B. H. P. Fisher, certainly one of the architects of union, if any man can so be called.

Much yet remains to be done, but nothing that is a matter of principle. The following may be mentioned: the name of the Church, the boundaries of the new dioceses, the financial support of Bishops, and the necessary trust association or

associations. However, the Plan of Union is now ready for the decisions of the Churches concerned. It may be mentioned that the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia has this year accepted the Plan, thus becoming the first Church-governing body to do so.

Though we have deviated from what was done in South India, this does not imply adverse criticism of the Church of South India, with which we hope to be in full communion. We have resolved that the fact that other Churches do not maintain the rule of episcopal ordination, which we have decided to observe from the start, shall not in itself preclude the united Church from having relations of fellowship and communion with them.

The Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan intends to combine the Congregational, Presbyterian and Episcopal principles of the Church. The episcopate will be constitutional, and the functions of the Bishops have been so framed as to secure their position as real Bishops.

Finally, it is impossible for all the ministers to meet together for an act of unification. The area covered and the numbers concerned are too great. Diocesan services of unification will be held, in which the Bishop and the presbyters of the diocese who have already taken part in the initial, representative service of unification will officiate.

The prayers of all the readers of this article are desired for the unification of Christ's Church, not merely in the area covered by these proposals but throughout the world. In North India we believe that God's will is organic union, and we believe this not only for ourselves, but for the whole world.

W. MACHIN

¹ Published by the Christian Literature Society for India, Madras; obtainable from the Lutterworth Press (2s.).

ODIC FORCE

A re-discovered Healing Power

THERE IS A healing power which may be as old as humanity, but which has been lost sight of for a hundred years and is only now receiving recognition in certain quarters. This healing energy has been called odic force, or odyle, or radiesthetic energy. Lest it should be thought that I am romancing, I hasten to add that I have addressed in London a meeting of doctors called 'The Medical Society for the Study of Radiesthesia'. They have their headquarters near Harley Street, issue reports from time to time, and have regular lectures delivered which I have had the privilege of attending. Some of these doctors use this odic force in their treatments. One, in Harley Street, has become a close friend of mine, and, though his theories need further exposition and clarification, I have seen some of his amazing results with my own eyes and can give a personal testimony to their value.

The term 'odic force' is the one which I prefer and shall use here. It derives from Odin, or Odan, or Wotan, the god of ancient Norse mythology, who was the Scandinavian counterpart of Jupiter or Zeus, and whose power permeated everything in heaven and earth. One might call 'odic force' the all-pervading energy. It was discovered or re-discovered a hundred years ago, though its discoverer was scorned, derided, insulted, and then ignored. Now, in my opinion, inquiry into it is leading us into a conception of a part of the universe as epoch-making and wonderful as astronomy has made the starry heavens and as nuclear physics has made atomic energy.

In Stuttgart from 1788 to 1869 lived a brilliant chemist called Carl Reichenbach. His ability as a chemist was recognized by all. He was not a doctor of medicine, but a Ph.D., and the discoverer of both creosote and paraffin (1830).

His researches into magnetism led him to a discovery which perhaps he would never have made had he not had the help of what is technically called a 'sensitive'; i.e. a person with abnormal psychic powers, including clairvoyance. Reichenbach found that 'sensitives' could see apparent emanations from a magnetized bar which they described as streams of light. Reichenbach himself was not a 'sensitive', but he discovered that 'sensitives' could also see such emanations from certain metals, crystals, from matter which was undergoing chemical change, and from the human body, much more marked with some people, but discernible in all.

Reichenbach first thought that this power was a quality of magnetism. He tried many experiments with it, and it was he who called it 'odic force' because he believed it penetrated everything. He also thought it to be similar to light, and in 1850 he published a four-volume work called *The Laws of Odic Light*. But later he declared that, though it was a real force which could be measured (e.g. he estimated that it took thirty seconds to traverse one hundred feet of iron wire of a stated calibre), it differed from heat, electricity, magnetism, or light.

Reichenbach in his ponderous treatise¹ discovered many things which stretch the credulity of one who comes newly to the subject. He found, for instance, that the hand of a 'sensitive' adhered to a magnet 'as a piece of iron does', and that water which had been in contact with a strong magnet could be distinguished by a 'sensitive' from ordinary water. A strong magnet caused the hand and arm of a cataleptic medium to move toward it as far as the body would allow.¹ He found, moreover, that water could be 'odicized' by using the fingers of the hand, which, to

the sensitive, produced the same results as a magnet. To grasp a sensitive, as we do when shaking hands, produced a disagreeable feeling, but to grasp both hands, right to left and left to right, produced a warm and comfortable sensation. Reichenbach writes: 'When I gave my hands to Mr Incledon and above all when I crossed them, he felt an intolerable headache.'²

Reichenbach holds that this power resides potently in the sun,⁴ but permeates the earth and everything upon it. All things conduct it, but loosely woven materials (like a net) hamper its flow, and silk partly insulates it. Iron wire carries it successfully and odic force was detected by a sensitive after it had passed along an iron wire thirty-three feet long and .0794 of an inch thick. The force was seen by the sensitive as 'a slender column of flame, ten to thirteen-and-a-half inches long with a breadth of .8 of an inch'.⁵

Odic force appears to increase by taking food, by being in the sunshine, and by general physical fitness. Reichenbach writes: 'Trials with Mademoiselle Maix and M. Schuh yielded the same results (as those he had reached earlier). They both found my hands more powerful after dinner than before it.'⁶ The light diffused by bodies possessing this force is exceedingly feeble and is not visible to every eye. Psychic sensitives see it. Other people, not psychically very sensitive, see it if they remain two hours in complete darkness. Then their eyes are frequently sufficiently prepared to perceive this light. During the two hours the eye must not be reached by the smallest trace of any other light.' Even a sensitive, he adds, 'cannot with certainty perceive magnetic light at a greater distance than forty inches'.⁶ Odic force resides in magnets, crystals, the hands, the sun, the moon, in artificial light, and in any matter undergoing chemical change, such as an acid on an alkali or an organic body undergoing decomposition.

Research into odic force is in its infancy. Very little is known, and I have a hunch that in the field of psychic research and by investigation into the so-called aura that surrounds the human body, we may find clues which will help us to understand. Perhaps, indeed, psychic research will make us alter altogether the very primitive and elementary ideas we have about this form of energy. It is alleged by some writers that healing odic force can be most readily introduced into the body at the chakrams, that is the 'power centres' of the etheric body which covers and to a short distance overlaps the physical body.

It is said that one's right hand is negative and one's left positive; and that a psychically sensitive person—unless left-handed—would prefer to have his left hand shaken rather than his right, for then negative flows to positive and is not repelled by its like. It is alleged that a sensitive can tell in which hand a person possessing odic force has held a glass of drinking-water. Held in the right hand (the negative one) the water tastes pleasant; held in the left (the positive) it has an unpleasant taste. Conversely, if a glass of water is placed in the blue light of the spectrum, the water to a sensitive will thereafter taste cool, pleasant, and slightly acid. A glass of water in orange or yellow light will subsequently taste to a sensitive nauseating, bitter, and distasteful.

A definition of odic force is difficult. I can only offer that put forward by Reichenbach himself in one of his letters. He defines it as 'a current of energy which emanates from certain organic and inorganic bodies, including human bodies, plants, magnets, crystals, and so on'. He thought that it was conducted through all bodies which are continuous in structure. He thought that it accounted

for the phenomenon of table-turning and the 'passes' made by the hands of the old-fashioned mesmerist.

He believed also that the curious behaviour of a pendulum, let us say of a pellet of cork hung on a thin silken thread, was determined by odic force. If the right hand of a sensitive touches the point from which a pendulum is suspended, the latter will swing. In his letters, Reichenbach refers to an experiment which he says proves that the right hand of a sensitive glows in the dark with a blue flame, the left with a yellowish-red flame. It is alleged that putrefaction gives off odic light, and the queer phosphorescence which sensitives have claimed to see over some of the graves in cemeteries, may find explanation here. When a long period has elapsed after death, no phosphorescent light is seen even by sensitives, for putrefaction has ceased.

Odic force, Reichenbach tells us, is discharged through the fingers and to some extent through the breath.* It is faster than heat in travelling and slower than electricity. It is not, like the latter, conducted over the surface of a conductor, but permeates it wholly. It is retained for some time in matter charged by it, and it is retained longest in oil. It is interesting that oil 'blessed' by being held in a Bishop's hand was used in the healing services of the early Church.

Science up to now has rejected the theory of odic force largely because science has not invented what we might call an 'odometer' with which to measure it. It does not affect the thermometer, or any other instrument in general use. Yet now scientists are considering it again, and it may well be that at our very finger-tips we have an energy of unpredictable value.

I am at the moment watching some interesting experiments on a purely scientific basis, and without reference to religion, by a medically qualified friend in the neighbourhood of Harley Street, whom I will call Dr X. He has in a marked degree this power, which Mrs Salmon has and which I think Harry Edwards and others have. It seems to me to be similar to what we call the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, without which even a slight cut would not heal. It is capable of producing muscular movements or twitchings in some patients. Whatever it is, it is frequently felt as heat. Some time ago Dr X held his extended hands a few inches from the skin of my bare shoulders—I had had some fibrositis—and all day my shoulders burned as if they had been poulticed. The pain disappeared. A friend of mine, a Bishop, had his fibrositis banished in a few moments by Dr X in the same way. Mrs Salmon's hands, she tells us, communicate this kind of heat.

But the mystery deepens. It is well known that psychically sensitive people, called 'dowsers' or 'water diviners', can detect the unseen presence of water because their muscles twitch when they pass over it. They frequently hold in their hands a twig, but it is their muscles, not the twigs, which are sensitive. The theory is that every substance sends out waves of a psychic kind, and the wave-length differs according to the substance that transmits it. The emanation of energy from the diviner meets the emanation from the water, and their meeting sets up a muscle spasm. These wave-lengths can be measured. Dr X showed me his chart with the calculated wave-length set up by every element known to chemistry. He recently 'discovered' a precious metal under a lonely moor by this method. His ideas were vindicated when engineers acted on his instructions and brought the metal to the surface.

Now conditions of disease, it is alleged, throw out varying wave-lengths according

to the nature of the illness. The tubercle bacillus, for instance, or T.B. germ, sends out wave-lengths which have been measured and which a psychically sensitive person can 'feel'. I was shown a bottle of T.B. germs at one end of a brass ruler divided into inches, and then shown an instrument which at regular distances (representing the wave-length) 'detected' the presence of T.B. This instrument placed near the lungs of a T.B. patient gives the same indication at the same distances, and thus confirms a T.B. diagnosis.

Where there is pain in the body, psychic energy is being lost, much as static electricity is 'lost' by running to earth. At this 'pain-point', by holding his hands in a certain position almost touching the skin, Dr X appears able to drive his own odic force into a body, powerfully enough to send it up the nerve paths to the cause of the pain, often with what appear to be miraculously therapeutic results. This seems to be what Mrs Salmon does, though she calls it the power of Christ, and what Mr Edwards does, believing it to be force passed through him by the power of spirits on the other side of death. Dr X believes it to be a perfectly normal form of energy not yet understood, but rapidly coming under the survey and understanding of science.

The most remarkable thing I have seen in my visits to Dr X's rooms was the case of a girl with a twisted pelvis, who, when he placed his hands near, but not touching, her thighs twisted her body in a most strange way. He said the body was trying to heal itself, to correct the faulty twist, in response to the force passing from his hands meeting the discharge of psychic energy from her pain, much as a water-diviner's hands twitch in response to the emanations from water. I found to my amazement that I could induce this reaction on her also.

Remarkable to me—who am not consciously sensitive in the psychic sense—was the discovery that, when asked by Dr X to tell him which part of a patient's back was causing her distress, as she lay face downward on his couch with her back exposed, I had only to run my hand down the length of the spinal column, a few inches from the skin surface, to feel unmistakably a sensation of pins and needles in my hand at one particular point, which turned out to be the focus-point of the pain. Dr X said that emanations from the pain-spot met the odic force from my own hand and set up the sensation in the latter.

On another occasion I took the late Bishop of Lichfield, Dr Woods, to see Dr X and one of the latter's patients was a little girl of three, who had been discharged from a famous children's hospital in London, her mother being told that the child has been injured at birth and would never walk. I held my own hands with Dr X in the appropriate place at the base of the spine, and our delight can be imagined when the child moved her legs for the first time in her life, and said: 'Mummy, I can move my legs.' The mother was overcome with tears of joy, and indeed the Bishop and all of us were deeply moved. The child can now get into a crouching position, and with a good deal of help can stand on her feet and walk a few steps.

It may be that here we have a clue to the understanding of the undoubted healing gift which some people possess, and I must say that investigation in the radiesthetic field seems to me more likely to bear fruit than investigation into spiritualism, where it is supposed that the so-called dead return and possess certain people and guide them to locate injury and treat the sufferer. I am not deriding the spiritualistic hypothesis, but to me it seems unnecessary.

The uncanny way in which some spiritualist healers find the correct spot where

pain and disability and disease lurk, and do so often without being told by the patient or his friends where the pain is or what the diagnosis may be, is possibly due to the sensation set up in the hand by odic force in the manner described above.

Researchers have been working in this field for many years, but it must be said that only a beginning has been made. The difficulties are enormous, and the prejudice against unorthodoxy in healing methods—while it probably safeguards patients against cranks, charlatans, and fanatics, and prevents treatment running too far ahead of theory and understanding—slows down the rate of progress.

Twenty years ago a specimen of blood from the finger of one of my children, sent on a bit of blotting paper to a 'radiesthetist', led her, by holding a pendulum over it and over certain bio-chemic salts, to prescribe a remedy which entirely cured a most obstinate and long standing disability which had made the child's life miserable for years.

Today if a diagnosis is doubtful, you may send a spot of blood to a laboratory in a famous city and receive not only a confirmation or otherwise of the diagnosis. *You can actually receive a photograph of the affected part* showing the damaged structures. Though the patient may have remained all the time in London, the blood-spot emits radiations which disclose to the scientist working there, the exact nature and scope of the disharmony. Each disease radiates its own characteristic wave-form and a method has been found whereby a 'force field' photograph can be taken of 'the condition of any cell-group in the body', the photograph showing not only the pathology but the state of the tissues involved. I have actually seen a photograph of the tuberculous lungs of a patient, showing clearly the extent of the disease, taken while the patient lay in a London hospital. *The instrument which took the photograph was fifty miles away.* All that was required on the spot was a drop of the patient's blood or a specimen of sputum. I have also seen a 'photograph' of a cow's stomach showing the presence in it of a length of wire and a large stone. *It was taken forty miles from the cow.* A veterinary surgeon confirmed the experiment by removing both wire and stone.

If, by this time, the reader is about to declare that the writer of this article is mad and that the reader cannot be asked to believe such nonsense, I will only remind him that fifty years ago if someone had told him that, by watching a screen in his home, he could see and hear in London something that was happening *at that precise moment* in Edinburgh, let alone New York, he would have made a similar reply. We are moving forward to discover that there are energies at work in the universe more wonderful than we have dared to dream.

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD

¹ *Researches on Magnetism, Electricity, Heat, Light, Crystallization and Chemical Attraction in their Relations to the Vital Force*, by Karl, Baron Von Reichenbach, Ph.D., translated by William Gregory, M.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh; published by Taylor, Watson and Maberly (London 1850).

² op. cit., p.25.

³ pp. 81-2 and 176.

⁴ p.96. Reichenbach believed that the magnetism of the earth acts as a magnet in the laboratory and discharges odic force. He taught that if people would arrange their beds with the head to the north and the feet to the south, they would sleep better as the lines of force would run with and not against the lines of force in the body.

⁵ pp. 100-1.

⁶ p. 196.

⁷ p.214.

⁸ p. 355.

⁹ cf. Elijah healing the widow's son (1 Kings 17¹⁷).

JONATHAN SWIFT AND THE WESLEYS

AT MIDNIGHT on Tuesday 22nd October 1745 the remains of Jonathan Swift were buried privately in St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, by the side of his beloved 'Stella', Esther Johnson, who had died seventeen years before. In accordance with his own injunctions, the austere ceremony was scrambled through without any of the pomp that later ages—and, indeed, his own—would have accorded as his right. To tell the truth, no personal mourners were left. His small circle of friends had already disintegrated. Even to the public he had been as good as dead for about five years, and for the last three years had been legally adjudged incapable of conducting his affairs. It was his lot, as he had feared it might be, to die 'like a poisoned rat in a hole'. He managed a last snarl at the end, however. His will, made in 1740, gave directions for an inscription over his tomb on a black marble tablet, 'in large letters, deeply cut and strongly gilded', announcing that he had gone 'where fierce disdain no longer wounds the heart' (*ubi saeva indignatio ulterius cor lacerare nequit*).

John Wesley and Jonathan Swift had much in common—more than is apparent at first glance. They stood almost alone in their day as men of great position in England who were yet deeply and practically interested in the welfare of despised Ireland. Much more were they alike in their hatred of all that was shoddy and unjust. Both were reformers at heart—aghast at abuses which they were determined to amend. Moral indignation has not always been allowed as a trait of Dean Swift's strangely-compounded character, but his literary genius can never fully be understood apart from this characteristic. In the very reforms they advocated there was similarity. Swift anticipated Wesley in lending small sums of money free of interest to deserving tradesmen who were in financial difficulties, which Wesley was later to elevate into a regular system, in his Foundery 'Lending Stock'. Wesley's time and attention were constantly engaged in works of charity, including the care of the sick; the same is largely true of Swift, and the money he left went to found a hospital for fifty patients. In Wesley's case, of course, there was very little to leave, his money having been used up for others during his life-time. Both Wesley and Swift warned the public against rapacious and unscrupulous Lawyers, both having first of all suffered by reason of their dealings with the law. Swift's championship of Ireland against exploitation, as seen in the Wood's Half-pence affair, is paralleled by Wesley's early defence of the American Colonies against English taxation—even though Dr Samuel Johnson's tract *Taxation no Tyranny* was later to convince him that his former attitude was mistaken. Both Swift and Wesley endeavoured to uphold the honour of the Established Church, though in quite different ways, and with far different results; both were animated by a strong distrust of Dissent. Both, of course, were clergymen.

For their purpose of reform, Swift and Wesley used the same literary weapon in a similar way. They issued a swarm of cheap pamphlets aimed at the common people, Swift's being usually anonymous, and Wesley's being very often so. The writings of both men were couched in direct, incisive English that was quite at variance with the general literary practice of their age, and a means of reform in itself. Incidentally, each of them tried his hand at stabilizing English literary usage, Swift in his *Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue*,

Wesley in *The Complete English Dictionary*. . . . By a Lover of Good English and Common Sense.

Although there are numerous, obvious, and important differences between the Fellow of Lincoln College and the Dean of St Patrick's, by special pleading even some of these contrasts might be twisted into comparisons. Swift's misanthropy, for instance, could easily be linked up with Wesley's conviction of the hopeless sinfulness of man apart from God. That there is real ground for comparison is enough, however, for our present purpose.

It so happens that the Wesley family as a whole had links more or less direct with Dean Swift. When young Jonathan was a poor relation befriended by the great Sir William Temple, he fell under the spell of the *Athenian Mercury*, a kind of seventeenth-century *Notes and Queries*. This, of course, was run by the Rev. Samuel Wesley, Rector of Epworth, in conjunction with his brother-in-law John Dunton, and Richard Sault, with the occasional assistance of the Rev. John Norris. So enthusiastic did young Swift become about the erudition displayed by the 'Athenian Society', as the sponsors of this periodical called themselves, that he ventured to try out his poetic wings in a flight that was far too lofty for him, a Pindaric *Ode to the Athenian Society*. It was this that induced John Dryden to incur Swift's hatred by saying: 'Cousin Swift, you will never be a poet.' The opinion is endorsed by a more disinterested modern critic, Mr Ricardo Quintana, who speaks of it as 'unquestionably the worst thing Swift ever wrote'. Did Samuel Wesley's heart swell with pride as he read the concluding lines of praise for the anonymous authors of the *Athenian Mercury*?

*And to all future mankind show
How strange a paradox is true,
That men who lived and died without a name
Are the chief heroes in the sacred lists of fame.*

Whilst in his feeble poetic beginnings Swift praised John Wesley's father without knowing it, when he got into his satiric stride the same Samuel Wesley was one of the butts of his ridicule. One of Swift's first prose publications, which by itself would have made his name a lasting one, was *A Full and True Account of the Battel (sic) Fought last Friday, Between the Ancient and the Modern Books in St James's Library*, more popularly known as *The Battle of the Books*. In this Swift chivalrously defends his benefactor Sir William Temple, now chiefly remembered as the recipient of the letters of Dorothy Osborne, who later became his wife. Temple is portrayed as the champion of sound classical learning and taste against the swarming pedants and commentators of modern days. Amongst the latter is numbered Samuel Wesley, whose pretensions to merit are dismissed very quickly:

Then Homer slew Wesley with a kick of his Horse's heel.

The 'Table, or Key' to the 1720 edition of the *Battle* gives the following synopsis of Homer's contribution to the slaughter of the 'Moderns':

Homer overthrows Gondibert; Kills Denham & Westly, Perrault & Fontenelle.

(One notes in passing the uncertainty in the spelling of the name which had been changed from the ancestral Westley to Wesley: the old spelling persisted for a time even with Samuel Wesley's more illustrious sons.) The fact that to Homer

was assigned the despatch of Wesley suggests that Swift had in mind the great folio which is supposed to have brought the Epworth preferment to its author, *The Life of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: an Heroic Poem In Ten Books*, published in 1693. This epic work also achieved for Wesley a niche in Pope's *Dunciad*, though Pope later relented, and amended the passage. Swift also seems to have changed his mind about the Rector of Epworth, or rather to have forgotten his literary prejudice in pity for the poverty-stricken *paterfamilias*. When Wesley's *magnum opus*, the *Dissertationes in Librum Jobi*, appeared many years later, Swift was numbered amongst those who strove to help its author to ensure good sales by allowing his own name to appear on the 'List of Subscribers'.

Whether as a sign of Christian forgiveness, or out of genuine literary appreciation, all Samuel Wesley's children were brought up to read and admire the works of Dean Swift, according to Mr G. J. Stevenson's *Memorials of the Wesley Family*, though not without just criticism of their irreligious and immoral tendencies. Samuel Wesley, junior, who himself became a minor poet of some repute, whilst an usher at Westminster School (again on the authority of Mr Stevenson) 'enjoyed much intercourse with the Tory poets and politicians, and was on intimate terms of friendship with Harley, Earl of Oxford, Pope, Swift, and Prior'. There is some doubt, however, whether his contact with Swift was very intimate, although Adam Clarke averred that Samuel Wesley, junior, was 'highly esteemed by Swift'.

It seems likely that John Wesley had no personal dealings with Swift, who was thirty-six years his senior, and well past his heyday when Wesley was approaching full maturity. The Dean of St Patrick's may have met the young Oxford don, already a Fellow of Lincoln College, whilst on his last visit to England during the summer of 1727. Wesley's unpublished Oxford diaries may show that he did—but we think not. They almost bumped into each other by way of that fascinating widow, Mrs Pendarves, who was to become Mrs Patrick Delany, and not, as at first had seemed likely, Mrs John Wesley. She had entered into a pert correspondence with Jonathan Swift about a year before she rather half-heartedly tried to renew her friendship with Wesley. In 1735-6, again, Wesley might have been in touch with Swift whilst negotiating the progress of his father's massive brain-child through the Press, but there is no direct evidence to prove that he actually was, apart from Swift's name in the list of subscribers.

Whilst Wesley's personal knowledge of Dean Swift cannot be proved, his literary indebtedness most certainly can. This fact, however, is obscured from both sides, both by the anonymity of Swift's writings, and by Wesley's plagiarism—not counted such a terrible literary sin in his day! The periodicals to which Swift contributed were read by Wesley, as they were by most educated men of the time, but little stress can be laid on this. It is very doubtful whether many of these contributions would be recognized for Swift's—even 'Stella' herself made mistakes in identification, and that after being supplied with detailed hints and clues by the author.

As far as Swift's verse is concerned, for obvious reasons most of this would not meet with the approval of the essentially refined and delicate mind of John Wesley. But he does at least reprint twenty-two of Swift's more innocuous lines, in praise of patriotism. These appeared in the *Arminian Magazine* for 1785, under the title: 'To the Earl of Oxford; sent him when he was in the Tower before his Trial. By Dean Swift.' Even so, these verses are not Swift's original composition, but a

translation from the much more respectable Horace! It is quite possible, of course, that other quotations from Swift's verse lie scattered about Wesley's *Works*, but Wesley's usual habit of anonymous quotation places endless difficulties in the way of the student.

It is likely that Wesley read several of Swift's pamphlets in their original dress. Some of them would undoubtedly make their appeal to the Methodist reformer of the English Church. We wonder if Wesley ever came across Swift's *A Letter to a young gentleman lately enter'd into Holy Orders*, dated 9th January 1719-20? This stresses several points that were dear to Wesley, such as speaking plainly and audibly, and the cultivation both of reading and of reason. Wesley would have nodded his head in emphatic agreement at Swift's description of a 'fashionable' preacher, delivering a typical sermon, with its

quaint, terse, florid Style, rounded into Periods and Cadencies, commonly without either Propriety or Meaning. I have listen'd with my utmost Attention for half an hour to an Orator of this Species, without being able to understand, much less to carry away, one single Sentence out of a whole Sermon.

The man who could advise his preachers 'scream no more, at the peril of your soul' would surely approve the following:

A plain convincing Reason may possibly operate upon the Mind both of a learned and ignorant Hearer as long as they live, and will edify a thousand times more than the Art of wetting the Handkerchiefs of a whole Congregation.

We know that at least one of Swift's pamphlets was cordially welcomed by Wesley, namely, his *Three Sermons: on Mutual Subjection*, 1 Peter 5.; on *Conscience*, 2 Corinthians 1.; on *the Trinity*, 1 John 5.. Of the third part of this he says:

One of the best tracts which that great man, Dean Swift, ever wrote, was his Sermon upon the Trinity. Herein he shows, that all who endeavoured to explain it at all, have utterly lost their way; have, above all other persons, hurt the cause which they intended to promote.

With this attitude toward the doctrine of the Trinity Wesley himself agrees, continuing:

It was in an evil hour that these explainers began their fruitless work. I insist upon no explication at all; no, not even on the best I ever saw; I mean, that which is given us in the Creed commonly ascribed to Athanasius.

The only reference of John Wesley's to Swift that is at all widely known is that in the immortal *Journal*. In October 1775 Wesley was riding on horseback from Northampton to London, and according to his usual custom was carrying a miscellaneous collection of books in his pack-saddle to dip into as he ambled along. On this occasion he writes:

In my way I looked over a volume of Dr Swift's *Letters*. I was amazed! Was ever such trash palmed upon the world under the name of a great man? More than half of what is contained in those sixteen volumes would be dear at twopence a volume; being all, and more than all, the dull things which that witty man ever said.

Wesley's disgust here leads him into error. Swift's letters never were, and we believe never will be, published in sixteen volumes. He is obviously getting mixed

up with the collected edition of Swift's *Works*, which he apparently knew. This, in twelve volumes octavo, had been issued by Hawkesworth in 1755; two more volumes were added by Bowyer, in 1762, and two more by Swift's cousin, Deane Swift, in 1765. To these sixteen volumes of *Works* were added in 1766 three volumes of *Letters*, edited by Hawkesworth, and a further three volumes of *Letters* in the following year, edited by Deane Swift. It seems likely that Wesley had picked up one of the three Hawkesworth-edited volumes of letters, which contained the famous *Journal to Stella*. The great Dr Johnson was to bestow the faint praise upon these letters that they had 'some odd attraction and as there is nothing to fatigue attention, if [the reader] is disappointed he can hardly complain'. One can readily understand that the inconsequent small-talk of Swift's gossiping diary would not appeal to the man who told his preachers not to waste time in tittle-tattle, and the baby-talk therein would infuriate him. One can hardly wonder at his judgement if his eye chanced on some such passage as this:

Poor Stella, won't Dingley leave her a little daylight to write to Presto? well, well, we'll have day-light shortly, spite of her teeth: and zoo must cly Lele, and Hele, and Hele aden. Must loo mimitate Pdfr, pay? Iss, and so la shall. And so leles fol ee rettle. Dood mollow.

Nor was there any joy for Wesley in working out in his leisure time such sentences as Swift jots down on 7th March 1710-11:

Yes, I understand your cypher, and Stella guesses right, as she always does. He gave me al bsadruk lboinpl dfaonr ufainfbtoy dbionufnad, which I sent him again by Mr Lewis.¹

Wesley's impatience probably kept him from reading the many references in the *Journal to Stella* to a wealthy branch of his own family, Mr and Mrs Garrett Wesley, whose home Swift frequented whilst in London. It was this same Garrett Wesley who offered young Charles Wesley the chance of becoming his heir, and even on his refusal apparently paid his scholastic fees anonymously. A more distant relative, Richard Colley, was eventually nominated as a substitute, on condition that he assumed the name Wesley. His son became the first Lord Mornington, the grandfather of the famous Duke of Wellington. In later years John Wesley was to refer to his brother's youthful decision as 'a fair escape'!

From various incidental references we can show that Wesley did not condemn all Swift's writings as 'trash'. When discussing the Rev. Philip Skelton, whom he calls 'a surprising writer', Wesley shows at least some appreciation of Swift, saying of Skelton:

When there is occasion, he shows all the wit of Dr Swift, joined with ten times his judgement; and with (what is far more) a deep fear of God, and a tender love to mankind.

Strangely enough, Skelton's *Proposals for the Revival of Christianity* were advertised in the *Gentleman's Magazine* as 'by an eminent Hand in Dublin', Swift obviously being intended, though later a correction of this popular belief appeared. Skelton, unlike Swift, was an 'exemplary clergyman', and even a friend to the Methodists in later years. In similar vein Wesley compares with Dean Swift one of his favourite poets, Dr John Byrom, author of 'Christians, awake'!

He has all the wit and humour of Dr Swift, together with much more learning, a deep and strong understanding, and, above all, a serious vein of piety.

¹ The impatient puzzler should skip every other letter.

These rather back-handed compliments to the greatest satirist of his day are redeemed when Wesley comes to speak of Swift's style as divorced from its often sordid subject-matter. Advising a would-be poet, Samuel Furly, he writes:

If you *will* imitate, imitate Mr Addison or Dr Swift,
adding in a later letter:

If you imitate any writer, let it be South, Atterbury, or Swift, in whom *all* the properties of a good writer meet.

Later still he sums it all up by claiming that after 'reading the most celebrated writers in the English tongue' for forty-five years he ought to know a good style when he sees one, and goes on to criticize the way in which Furly is raising objections about Swift's style:

Whether *long* periods or *short* are to be chosen is quite another question. Some of those you transcribe from Swift are long; but they are *easy*, too, entirely easy, void of all stiffness, and therefore just such as I advise *you* to copy after.

It was exactly this plain easiness of Swift's style that annoyed Dr Johnson and made him parry Boswell's defence of Swift's *Conduct of the Allies* with the words:

No, Sir, Swift has told what he had to tell distinctly enough, but that is all. He had to count ten, and he has counted it right.

Johnson himself could not always count ten very clearly, however, as is seen when he came to deliver his ponderous verdict on Swift's style in the *Lives of the Poets*:

His sentences are never too much dilated or contracted; and it will not be easy to find any embarrassment in the complication of his clauses, any inconsequence in his connexions, or abruptness in his transitions. His style was well suited to his thoughts, which are never subtilized by nice disquisitions, decorated by sparkling conceits, elevated by ambitious sentences, or variegated by far-sought learning.

One would like to have Swift's verdict on this Johnsonian masterpiece!

There is little doubt that both John and Charles Wesley had themselves caught something of the satiric sting of Swift's compact style, though the measure of their literary indebtedness through their reading in the Epworth Rectory cannot adequately be assessed. Wesley's remarks on doctors have a Swiftian ring about them:

Calling on a friend, I found him just seized with all the symptoms of a pleurisy. I advised him to apply a brimstone plaster, and in a few hours he was perfectly well. Now to what end should this patient have taken a heap of drugs and lost twenty ounces of blood? To what end? Why to oblige the doctor and apothecary. Enough! Reason good!

Compare his remarks about the lawyer who took up 'thirteen or fourteen sheets of treble-stamped paper' to prove that a man who smuggled £4 of brandy owed £577 to the Government:

In the name of truth, justice, mercy, and common sense, I ask: (1) Why do men lie for lying sake? Is it only to keep their hands in? . . . (2) Where is the justice of swelling four pounds into five hundred and seventy-seven? (3) Where is the common sense of taking up fourteen sheets to tell a story that may be told in ten lines? (4) Where is the mercy of thus grinding the face of the poor? thus sucking the blood of a poor, beggared prisoner?

Would not this be execrable villany if the paper and writing together were only sixpence a sheet, when they have stripped him already of his little all, and not left him fourteen groats in the world?

Wesley's description of an inventive genius might almost have come from Swift's *Laputa*:

He is the greatest genius in little things that ever fell under my notice. . . . He invents all sorts of gadgets, fire-screens, and lamps and inkhorns. . . . I really believe were he seriously to set about it he could invent the best mouse-trap that ever was in the world.

Epigrams worthy of Swift are his sayings about 'a black swan, an honest lawyer!', and 'The Scots dearly love the word of the Lord—on the Lord's day!' Perhaps we see Wesley at his Swiftian best when discussing the subject which called forth some of Swift's most pungent satire, War:

Here are forty thousand men gathered together on this plain. What are they going to do? See, there are thirty or forty thousand more at a little distance. And these are going to shoot them through the head or body, or stab them, or split their skulls, and send most of their souls into everlasting fire, as fast as they possibly can. Why so? What harm have they done to them? O none at all! They do not so much as know them. But a man, who is King of France, has a quarrel with another man, who is King of England. So these Frenchmen are to kill as many of these Englishmen as they can, to prove the King of France is in the right.

We find exactly the same kind of thing in Charles Wesley's verse, more especially when he is whipped up into a fury against the Calvinist teaching that God pre-ordained unborn souls to eternal damnation:

*And whom He never once did love
Threatens to love no more;
From them He doth revoke
The grace they did not share,
And blot the names out of His book
That ne'er were written there.*

Examples of these satirical paradoxes abound in the collections of hymns written as a weapon in this theological warfare, *Hymns on God's Everlasting Love*—amongst the earliest of Charles Wesley's compositions, and therefore nearest to any reminiscences of Swift's satire that he may have had. Another example may be quoted:

*The righteous God consign'd
Them over to their doom,
And sent the Saviour of mankind
To damn them from the womb;
To damn for falling short
Of what they could not do,
For not believing the report
Of that which was not true.*

This similarity between the style of Wesley (i.e. John Wesley) and Swift has been remarked by a number of scholars. Sir Leslie Stephen says that Wesley's 'English

is allied to that of Swift or Arbuthnot', whilst Professor Elton claims that Wesley is 'as concise as Swift when he tells a story, or sums up a case, or judges an author'.

C. E. Vulliamy remarks:

In polemical writing he is said to have taken as his pattern the First Epistle of St John; in more discursive essays he was admittedly inspired by Swift.

Dr T. B. Shepherd notes a similar parallel:

Just as Swift's satire almost appals by its quietness, so Wesley seems to grow calmer and more reasonable as he comes to his main arguments.

That John Wesley was familiar with Swift's main works seems fairly obvious from what has already been said. Mr C. L. Ford apparently thought not, however. He claimed, for instance, that Wesley missed the point of an allusion to Swift's *Tale of a Tub* in reading Lord Lyttelton's *Dialogues of the Dead*. This latter once-popular work Wesley read in 1770, though he was not altogether pleased with it, especially with its unjust reflections on the Methodists. The fourth dialogue in the book is between Joseph Addison and Jonathan Swift. When Mercury appears on the heavenly scene he greets Swift effusively (ignoring Addison) thus:

How does my old Lad? How does honest *Lemuel Gulliver*? Have you been in *Lilliput* lately, or the *flying Island*, or with your good nurse *Glumdalclitch*? Pray when did you eat a crust with Lord Peter? Is *Jack* as mad still as ever? I hear the poor fellow is almost got well by more gentle Usage. If he had but more Food he would be as much in his Senses as Brother Martin himself. But Martin, they tell me, has spawned a strange brood of fellows called *Methodists*, *Moravians*, *Hutchinsonians*, who are madder than *Jack* was in his worst days. It is a pity you are not alive again to be at them.

We feel quite sure that Wesley did not mistakenly assume that the 'Jack' referred to was himself (as Mr Ford seems to suggest) rather than John Calvin. Like the rest of the Wesley family he had almost certainly read *The Tale of a Tub*, though perhaps like his sister Martha he 'thought it too irreverent to be atoned for by the wit'. We may be sure that the biting religious analogy of 'this wild work', as Johnson called it, which probably cost Swift a bishopric, was not lost on Wesley. He did not deem it desirable, however, to mention the book to the susceptible Methodist public. Lyttelton's summing up of Swift's suggested duties in the after-life would surely appeal to Wesley:

When any Hero comes hither from Earth who wants to be humbled (as most Heroes do), they should set Swift upon him to bring him down. The same good Office he may frequently do to a Saint swoln too much with the Wind of spiritual Pride; or to a Philosopher vain of his Wisdom and Virtue. He will soon shew the first, that he cannot be Holy, without being Humble; and the last, that with all his boasted Morality, he is but a better kind of *Yahoo*. I would also have him apply his anticosmetic Wash to the painted face of female vanity, and his Rod, which draws blood at every stroke, to the hard back of indolent Folly or petulant Wit.

Lyttelton raises an interesting speculation by his regret that Swift was not alive to pillory the 'strange brood of fellows called Methodists'. If he had been, we can be pretty sure that with his hatred of anything savouring of 'enthusiasm' he would have been among the ranks of those who scribbled abuse of Wesley and (more especially) of Whitefield.

So far we have scarcely mentioned Swift's chief claim to immortality, *Travels into several Remote Nations of the World. In Four Parts. By Lemuel Gulliver*. Had Wesley read *Gulliver's Travels*? If so, what did he think of it? From the silence of his writings most scholars have assumed that Wesley did not know the book, though it was bought and discussed as avidly in Oxford as in London circles in 1726, and could hardly have escaped the notice of the studious but still unregenerate don. Certainly it was familiar in the household of Charles Wesley, for he wrote to his wife about the escapades of their children (and the sentence was obviously intended to be read to them):

If Lilliputians will run races with Brobdingnaggians, what can they expect but a Fall for their Pride and Ambition?

John Wesley also knew at least something of Captain Gulliver's adventures. In commenting on Captain Jonathan Carver's *Travels*, which he read on a journey in 1790, Wesley says:

Here is no gay account of the Islands of Pelew or Lapita, but a plain relation of matter of fact.

'Lapita' is of course Swift's Laputa, though it is rather unkind of Wesley to link it up with the absolutely authentic Pelew Islands. Obviously, in common with most readers, Part III of *Gulliver's Travels* had impressed him least favourably.

A few years ago the present writer was excited to realize that this by no means ends Wesley's demonstrable acquaintance with Swift's greatest work. He discovered that in his *Doctrine of Original Sin* Wesley had lifted long passages verbatim from *Gulliver's Travels*—without acknowledgement, of course! The thrill of discovery was however modified a few months later on finding that Sir Leslie Stephen also knew of this indebtedness of Wesley to Swift. *The Doctrine of Original Sin* (1757) is Wesley's largest 'original' work, and is judged by some scholars to be his best. Much of the earlier part of it reminds one forcibly of the style of Swift. This makes the transitions from Wesley's own words to the quotations from Swift all the more natural.

The passages quoted from *Gulliver's Travels* are seven in number. In picturing the evil conditions of the day, Wesley has recourse to Gulliver's description of European ways for the benefit of the King of Brobdingnag, speaking of it as 'that humorous but terrible picture, drawn by a late eminent hand'. Wesley interpolates his own sharp comment even after he had started his quotation:

He was perfectly astonished (and who would not be, if it were the first time he had heard it?) at the historical account I gave him of our affairs during the last century; protesting it was only a heap of conspiracies, rebellions, murders, massacres.

For anyone who is interested in collating Wesley's quotation with the original, two interesting points will emerge. The first is that Wesley in his usual way makes use of his abridging pen. Truly most of the wordy writers of the time needed cutting down a little, but the same cannot normally be said of Swift. However, the passage does not suffer as a result of Wesley's pruning. The second is that, whilst apparently continuing to quote the same speech of Gulliver to the King of Brobdingnag, Wesley actually jumps right over to Glubbdubdrib, with a transitional phrase and

a change of tense; here, after quoting two sentences he omits a whole paragraph, and then quotes parts of the opening sentences of the next paragraph. Yet the whole thing reads quite consecutively! To round this section off, Wesley concludes:

Well might that keen author add: 'If a creature pretending to reason can be guilty of such enormities, certainly the corruption of that faculty is far worse than brutality itself.'

This, though apparently from the same passage, is actually a quotation from Chapter 5 of *A Voyage to the Houyhnhnms*! So Wesley skips lightly over three of Swift's mythical countries, in three separate parts of *Gulliver's Travels*, in order to piece together a paragraph on European history and politics!

Wesley next turns to evils that are to be found at home, instancing in particular the perverting of justice. Here an obvious quotation lies to hand in Swift's diatribe against lawyers in the *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms*, Chapter 5, following shortly after his previous quotation about reason:

There is a society of men among us, bred up from their youth in the art of proving, according as they are paid, by words multiplied for the purpose, that white is black, and black is white.

In spite of its obvious power as satire, the passage which follows about the disputed possession of a cow is cut down to almost exactly one quarter of its original size, and is strangely made more convincing as a result. This section of Wesley's treatise is rounded off by another quotation from the *Voyage to Brobdingnag*, Chapter 6.

There follows a section on war, which Wesley describes as:

a still more horrid reproach to the Christian name, yea, to the name of man, to all reason and humanity. There is war in the world! war between men! war between Christians!

In enlarging upon the causes and conduct of war, Wesley quotes long passages from the *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms*, Chapter 5, neatly dovetailing into them a whole new paragraph from Chapter 12 of the same voyage, and a long paragraph of his own, which was quoted above. One is amazed at the pains and ingenuity that Wesley takes to piece together the different quotations, with a phrase altered here, omitted there, or added elsewhere. Scissors-and-paste work, it is true, but the finished product is something to be proud of!

We believe that *Gulliver's Travels* was read by Wesley during his Oxford days. The Oxford Diaries will probably reveal this. In any case, he would probably follow out his regular student practice with the book, copying out noteworthy passages in a commonplace book—'collecting' it, as this was termed in his day. From such a commonplace book he could more easily fit together disconnected passages into a sequence, as we have seen that he actually did. When the time came to use these extracts he would almost certainly know the name of the author, if he was unaware of it when the book was first read. But he obviously found it wisest to conceal the authorship under the phrase 'a late eminent hand'.

Whilst this was a common practice with Wesley, was there not even greater need for anonymity where Dean Swift was concerned? Was he not a writer of dangerous tendencies, even though there were a few passages in his writings worth passing on to the Methodists? Wesley would not even rebuke the Dean's scatological obsession, for fear of awakening people's morbid interest—though he does go so

far as to quote approvingly in the preface to one of his medical publications the following criticism of Swift:

In all his writings he shows an uncommon affection for the last concoction of the human nutriment.

Wesley was one of those who realized the truth of what a recent critic has said about Swift:

No English writer of corresponding stature has been repudiated so persistently and so fiercely by immediately succeeding generations, but this repudiation had in it a strange kind of excitement which was instantly communicated, so that one did not avoid the fearful object but sought it out in fascinated horror. . . . Through the immoderate hostility of his critics Swift's fame was assured.

John Wesley, whilst he obviously had many scores against Swift, would not enter the ranks of his 'immoderate critics'. Instead, he was ready to use and even recommend (chiefly in private letters, be it noted!) what was good in Swift, without unduly advertising the name of a man to whom the taint of evil certainly clung. As for the evil side of Swift's work, Wesley was content to let it die its natural death in public esteem, as it largely has done.

FRANK BAKER

GEORGE BURNETT (1734-93)

GEORGE BURNETT was one of the 'forty or fifty' Evangelical clergymen who received John Wesley's circular letter written from Scarborough on 19th April 1764.¹ A brief note introduced an appeal for a union of Church of England ministers who agreed on the essentials of Original Sin, Justification by Faith, and Holiness of Heart and Life. George Burnett is not listed amongst the virtuous trio who replied to this plea. Telford supplied no footnote to Burnett's name and Curnock simply identified him as 'G. Burnett, Vicar of Elland'. A more extended account of his life and labours may prove of interest.

George Burnett was born in 1734.² He was a Scotsman, hailing from Aberdeen, where his father, John Burnett, resided as a gentleman.³ George Burnett was brought to Cornwall in 1749⁴ by his fellow countryman and godfather, George Conon. Conon had been Master of Truro Grammar School since 1729,⁵ and was the spiritual parent of Samuel Walker, the Evangelical Curate of Truro. Burnett became an Assistant in the Grammar School, lived with Conon at the school-house and was treated as his son.⁶ In this period he came under the influence of Samuel Walker and felt the call to the Ministry of the Church of England.

Under the supervision of Conon and Walker he began to equip himself for orders. He had become intimate with Thomas Haweis, later well known as a Chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon and a pioneer of the London Missionary Society,⁷ another protégé of Walker who was also preparing for the ministry. The two young candidates, who were the same age, studied together.⁸ They applied themselves to Latin and at the same time sought to attain proficiency as preachers. Walker bitterly regretted that in his early training he had not acquired the art of

extemporaneous speech and determined to exercise his two pupils in this particular from the start. Not only were they put through an intensive course of homiletics, but one afternoon a week they were called upon to preach *ex tempore* before Walker's household.

There was a plan set afoot to send Haweis for a period of tuition under Thomas Adam of Winteringham: whether it was intended that Burnett should accompany him is not clear. This scheme, however, was not carried out, and Burnett and Haweis matriculated together at Christ Church, Oxford, on 1st December 1755.⁹ Walker wrote to William Rawlings on 16th December 1755: 'We have continually letters from T. and G. which give us a good deal of content. They are in a barren land, and will need your prayers. Poor young men, it is well for them that they are together, and especially for your favourite that George is with him. Nothing [can be] more providential, he is so suited [to him]. I know no other so fit for him. They are lovely youths. I have the greatest hopes for them. If they stand their ground, they will be both diligent and useful. They have both their temptations, and both their excellences. Tom will be in danger of over-rashness, and George of over-caution. George will make the greater figure, and Tom will be the most liked. Should they be associates in a cure, nothing would be more desirable. Well, you never forget them. Their well doing is a matter of great importance to the world, for I am either so fond or so foolish as to think they have not many equals.'¹⁰ Walker's prophecy was hardly fulfilled. Haweis made much the greater figure, but was far from being universally popular, as his subsequent sufferings for the Gospel indicate.

Burnett and Haweis remained at Oxford until the spring of 1756 and then returned to Cornwall, where they spent ten months pursuing their studies. They were initiated into the intricacies of Hebrew by Conon and made reasonable progress.¹¹ Walker wrote to Adam under the date 10th May 1756: 'Mr Haweis, the young gentleman I formerly spoke of, and his friend Mr Burnett, are returned to us from Oxford. Their fortunes, nor indeed opportunities of improvement, would not admit of their long continuance there. They purpose studying with me and my friend and father, Mr Conon, the schoolmaster till next spring, by which time, we doubt not they will be well qualified. They are both good scholars, and have a tolerable foundation in Hebrew. I have no doubt of their heart qualifications for the work. In truth, they are lovely and promising young men.'¹²

The matter of securing ordination for these two candidates was to prove problematical, branded as they were from the outset with a name of opprobrium. The diocese of Exeter, in which Truro then stood, was particularly unsuitable for this purpose, as the anti-Methodist prejudices of the Bishop, George Lavington, were only too well known. In the letter quoted above, Walker asked Adam if he could use his influence with Archdeacon Bassett¹³ to procure ordination from the Bishop of Lincoln. By 9th March 1757 the matter in the case of Burnett was growing more urgent. In a letter of this date Walker renewed his pressure on Adam. Walker supplied the highest testimonial respecting Burnett: 'For, to say truth, he is all I could wish him, and I doubt not will be eminently diligent in the ministry.' 'I venture to answer for him in every respect; and we shall be glad if he may be near you, since we cannot keep him near us.'¹⁴ By April there was evidently some hope of Adam securing a neighbouring curacy for Burnett, and Walker was encouraged to write: 'I heartily wish you may succeed for George Burnett. Nothing will please

father Conon and me better than having him near you. As for the country, George is a Scotsman; and for the pecuniary conditions, he will take whatever you may agree to in his behalf; so should the thing offer, do not let it slip through your hands while you are writing to us. Nothing will hinder George's acceptance, but a pre-engagement, of which at present he has no immediate prospect.'¹⁰ Adam replied in June, however, to the effect that his clergyman neighbour had decided to give his unsatisfactory curate a longer trial 'upon seeming penitence, and large promises of amendment',¹¹ and we hear no more of the offer in this correspondence.

In October 1757 Burnett, along with Walker, Jane, and Haweis, journeyed to Lincolnshire to visit Thomas Adam.¹² Later in the same year a title was secured for Burnett in the diocese of Canterbury.¹³ He was at Bristol with Walker when the news was received. They decided, however, first to seek an audience with Bishop Lavington in London and prevail upon him to authenticate Burnett's testimonials so that he might obtain orders from the Bishop of Wells (who was also in London at the time), to take a curacy in Bath.¹⁴ This attempt failed, as Lady Coningsby, on whom they were depending, decided that it would be futile to apply. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Hutton, refused Burnett's application upon his title in Kent and later the Bishop of Worcester¹⁵ indicated his unwillingness to ordain him even if he could find an opening in his diocese. Such was the price of loyalty to evangelical principles, for no other charge stood against Burnett.

Meanwhile the opposition raised against Conon¹⁶ on the same score had seriously reduced the numbers in Truro Grammar School, so that an Assistant was no longer needed, nor could, indeed, be supported. Burnett was likely to fall between two stools and Walker appealed to Adam to devise a scheme to maintain him at College until he could get orders.¹⁷

In February 1758 Burnett was teaching languages in London.¹⁸ His advisers considered this a step more likely to facilitate his obtaining orders than his going back to Oxford, to which he did not incline himself, although a most generous offer of assistance was made by an unnamed spinster. Burnett may possibly have been toying with the idea of seeking a sphere of ministry among the Dissenters, as Walker refers to his inquiry about the controversy between the Established Church and the Nonconformists.¹⁹ It may be that he went through an experience similar to that of John Newton in this respect. At all events, if he ever entertained any thoughts of leaving the Church of England in these early days (and as a Scotsman his attachment would necessarily be less close), he certainly atoned for his vacillation by becoming one of the staunchest defenders of her polity.

The next available piece of evidence is Samuel Walker's letter to Burnett immediately after his ordination.²⁰ This is dated 25th September 1758. Walker had intended to write before the event, but although unable to do so he and the Truro society had not been wanting in prayer on Burnett's behalf, especially on the great day itself. The letter contains no clue as to the place of ordination or the Bishop ordaining. It is full of sound spiritual advice on such an occasion, but is historically uninformative. A. C. H. Seymour, in *The Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon*, says that on his ordination Burnett 'became curate to the Rev. Mr Rawlings of Padstow'.²¹ Burnett may have been Curate at Padstow, although I understand from Dr H. Miles Brown that the Parish Registers there contain no trace of his signature, but he certainly could not have assisted William Rawlings, who did not become Vicar until 1790.²² The often unreliable Seymour has elsewhere

confused father and son. He makes the astounding statement: 'The Rev. William Rawlings, formerly of Exeter College, Oxford, and for forty years Vicar of Padstow, was the intimate and bosom friend of Mr Walker of Truro.'¹⁰ This Rawlings was in actual fact born in the year of Walker's death. It was his father, also William Rawlings, who was a companion and correspondent of Walker and of Lord Dartmouth. He was a prominent Cornish merchant who resided first at St Columb and only after 1770 at Padstow.¹¹ If indeed Burnett was Curate of Padstow, it appears strange that after suffering all his episcopal refusals he should have gained ordination at the hands of the formidable Lavington.

Seymour states that Burnett next laboured in Yorkshire. This refers, no doubt, to the period when Burnett assisted Henry Venn. In an undated letter, evidently penned in the summer of 1759, Walker informed Adam: 'George still has poor health. We here are for his removal, but George demurs. What think you of having him for a neighbour? Mr Venn is presented to Huddersfield in Yorkshire (by the map, it should be near Leeds) and has requested his assistance. There is one main difficulty. He must have the care of a school. Our first acquaintance with this is by the post today. We shall answer immediately, and he will decide. We fear his health greatly where he is, yet things seem promising, and it is a barren land.'¹² Burnett stayed with Walker in the late summer of 1759,¹³ and journeyed to Huddersfield via Bristol and Kineton (where he visited William Talbot) in October of that year.¹⁴ He took with him for Venn's consideration a rough outline of Walker's *Hints for a Scheme more effectively to carry on the work of reformation at this time begun in divers parts of the Kingdom, under regular ministers of the Church of England*.¹⁵

Burnett was two years at Huddersfield, according to Seymour, and some idea of Venn's appreciation of his services may be gleaned from the following excerpt from a letter to Lord Dartmouth: 'I am greatly relieved and comforted by the presence and help of my dear fellow labourer in the kingdom and patience of Christ, Mr Burnett; a man made to reprove the lightness of my mind, quick to discern, and bold to admonish, of unseemly carriage, yet with such unaffected humility and visible tenderness, as to make his reproofs like a polished shaft. I have great reason to adore that Providence which has brought us together, and if I do not pervert the grace of God, his joining me will further much the prosperity of my soul.'¹⁶

Burnett's uncertain health curtailed his stay in Yorkshire. By June 1760 Henry Venn was regretfully telling Mrs Knipe: 'I shall stand in need of the pleasure your company imparts; as I am about to have a severe trial, I fear, in parting with Mr Burnett. His friends in Cornwall advise him entirely to leave Yorkshire, under a notion that he has too much duty laid upon him. I am apprehensive he will be persuaded; and where I shall get an Assistant, whose heart is engaged to save souls and to preach Christ Crucified without unscriptural peculiarities, I know not.'¹⁷ On 26th June 1760 Lord Dartmouth informed William Rawlings that Burnett had left Huddersfield, much to the sorrow of Venn, who had paid this tribute: 'My faithful helper in the Lord's work, after many repeated efforts to continue in the exercise of his duty, is obliged to desist: his behaviour under these afflicting circumstances, glorifies his Saviour and recommends his faith. Invincible patience, and the deepest humiliation, justifying God and accepting the strokes of His rod as a punishment for iniquity, joined to steadfast confidence in the Lord Jesus Christ, are the abiding tempers of his heart. It is my prayer that he may be restored to

help me; for I may really say of Mr Burnett as Paul of Timothy, I know few like-minded, who preach the hatred and mortification of sin, whilst they exalt the free grace and righteousness of our God and Saviour; who teach men to live in the denial of every evil temper, and in the exercise of every heavenly grace, and at the same time, sensible of their vileness, to cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner".³⁸

Seymour places a year's residence in Kent after Burnett's departure from Huddersfield. This may be connected with the title that had already been given him in this county. Archbishop Hutton had now died and his successor, Thomas Secker, was a little less harshly disposed toward the Evangelicals.

In 1761 Burnett, his health much improved,³⁹ accepted the vicarage of Elland, in Yorkshire, which was in the presentation of Dr Leigh, who was Vicar of Halifax from 1731 to 1776.⁴⁰ Before he set out for his parish he visited the death-bed of Samuel Walker. He reached Blackheath—where Walker was lodged under Lord Dartmouth's roof—on 11th July. In letters to an unnamed friend and to Conon⁴¹ he describes the pathetic scene. He was with his beloved father in God almost until the end and conveyed the sad news to William Rawlings in a touching letter: 'Mr Walker is no longer an inhabitant of this world—yesterday, at a quarter past nine in the morning, he left a poor sickly body, and joined the society of heaven. His death was like his behaviour in sickness—without a groan: I was not present; Mr Jane and Mrs Randall had withdrawn for a moment, and the next moment, word was brought that he was gone.'⁴²

Under this cloud of bereavement Burnett began his Elland ministry. Here he settled for twenty years, during which he was well content to spend and be spent in the Master's service. He was indefatigable in good works and discharged the responsibilities of his vocation with a zeal and efficiency unusual in his day. One incident illustrates his conscientiousness in an unscrupulous age. He was once riding with William Richardson and another friend in the neighbourhood of York. When they came near a turnpike gate within a few miles of the city, they turned their horses round with the intention of returning home. Burnett rode up to Richardson and said very seriously: 'Do you think now, that it is right to have used so much of the road without paying the toll?'⁴³

In 1763 George Burnett figured in one of John Wesley's letters to Henry Venn. The distance between himself and Venn had not been lessened, Wesley declared, by 'that honest, well-meaning man Mr Burnett, and by others, who have talked largely of my dogmatism, love of power, errors and irregularities'.⁴⁴ When Burnett first went as Curate to Huddersfield the situation between the Methodists and the Parish Church was already a delicate one. Walker suspected that Burnett might run into trouble. 'There is an old society of John Wesley's in the parish', he told Thomas Adam, when Burnett had just left for Huddersfield. 'It will be a nice matter neither to quarrel nor join with them.'⁴⁵ Huddersfield became a test case for Wesley's attitude to a regular Evangelical ministry—for he sincerely believed that itinerancy was a more effective instrument of the Kingdom than a settled pastorate.⁴⁶ There was much to be said for his view, of course, when the incumbent was lazy and incompetent. There was still something in his argument as it applied to such faithful men as Vincent Perronet at Shoreham and Thomas Adam at Winteringham, neither of whom saw any considerable fruits during their long ministries. But there was little to uphold Wesley's conviction in the case of such a man of God as Henry Venn, under whose ministry at Huddersfield a genuine

work of grace was going on. It seemed reasonable that Wesley should follow the repeated counsel of Samuel Walker to hand over his societies to the incumbent of the parish when he was an Evangelical.

On the other hand it could be argued that the Methodists had preceded Venn at Huddersfield and, as John Pawson says,⁴⁰ had actually been instrumental in bringing him to the parish. Now this was, as Wesley himself urged, a tender point. 'Where there is a Gospel ministry already, we do not desire to preach,' he went on, 'but whether we can leave off preaching because such an one comes after is another question, especially when those who were awakened and convinced by us beg and require the continuance of our assistance.'⁴¹ Moreover, the Methodists would still be there, he trusted, after Venn had gone. What guarantee was there that a sympathetic Vicar would follow? Wesley, however, did withdraw his preachers for a time at Venn's request, but in 1765 they resumed their visits.

In this ticklish situation Burnett no doubt showed himself a true disciple of Samuel Walker in disapproving Wesley's irregularity on this point. And if, as Wesley asserted, the doctrine of Perfection had been 'brought in head and shoulders'⁴² to widen the breach, Burnett, as an at least moderate Calvinist, would once more find himself at variance with the founder of Methodism. But our knowledge of Burnett's character and spirit assures us that no virulence or vindictiveness would mark the expression of his sincerely held views, and Wesley himself conceded that he was 'honest' and 'well meaning'.⁴³

Burnett's return to Yorkshire meant a renewed intimacy with Henry Venn. The ties that bound these faithful soldiers of Christ were drawn closer in the year 1767 when Venn lost his wife. An account of her death is given by Thomas Wills in his *Spiritual Register*.⁴⁴ Her remains were interred by torchlight and Burnett preached in the church during the service. Seymour gives further evidence of his unreliability by describing Burnett as 'afterwards Vicar of Elland'⁴⁵ when, of course, he had then been Vicar of Elland for six years. Though separated by many miles when Venn left Huddersfield in 1771 to become Rector of Yelling, Huntingdonshire, the cordial links were never broken, and as late as 1789 Venn wrote to his daughter, Mrs Elliott, rejoicing in the prospect of meeting Burnett and his wife at Cambridge: 'Delightful friendship! of more than thirty years' standing—steady and unalterable—not to be reflected on without gratitude to God who giveth us to say, "All our delight is in the saints that are on the earth, and such as fear the Lord".'⁴⁶

The name of George Burnett will perhaps be perpetuated principally because of his connexion with the Elland Society. In 1767 Venn had founded a Clerical Society, on the model of Walker's Clerical Club, in which Evangelical clergymen could meet for prayer, fellowship, and mutual edification. When he removed in 1771 the meetings were continued by Burnett in his vicarage. At one of these gatherings the difficulty of finding Evangelical Curates was discussed and it was decided to inaugurate a fund to assist suitable candidates for orders to go to Oxford or Cambridge. This was in 1777.⁴⁷ Help was forthcoming from some of the wealthy Evangelical laymen like John Thornton, and the Elland Society was launched upon its long career of usefulness. In a letter to Lord Dartmouth⁴⁸ Burnett outlined the rules which governed it. So far all the students had gone to Cambridge 'where Mr S. Key of Magdalene has exceedingly befriended them, and the tutors Farish⁴⁹ and Jowett⁵⁰ are both serious men', but there was no rule

preventing them going to Oxford. None of them were placed above the rank of sizar. Lord Dartmouth evidently lent his interest and financial support to the Society. One of the first to receive a grant was Samuel Marsden, the apostle of New Zealand. He was educated under Joseph Milner,¹⁰ himself a member of the Elland Society, at Hull Grammar School, and then adopted by the Society and sent to Magdalene College, Cambridge, in 1790.¹¹

Meanwhile Burnett had inherited the savings of his godfather, Conon, who died a bachelor in 1775. Conon's epitaph, in Latin, engraved on plainstone in Padstow Church was composed by Burnett.¹²

Several of Burnett's letters were published in the *Christian Guardian* for the years 1811 to 1813. They belong to the later period of his life. Three of them are to his friend William Rawlings of Padstow and contain reminiscences of his early days. He was still hungry for Truro news. In 1781 he visited Adam for the last time and in 1784 sadly recorded the death of his old and trusted guide.¹³ In 1785 Burnett took the long journey to Glasgow where he met relations and preached in the Episcopalian churches.

George Burnett died at Elland on 8th July 1793.¹⁴ He was not aged sixty, as Boase states, but fifty-eight or fifty-nine.¹⁵ Burnett's obituary notice in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (not always favourable to the Evangelicals) refers to him as 'this very valuable man' and continues: 'The Church of England had not a more firm and decided friend, nor true religion a more sincere and consistent advocate. In doctrines he adhered closely to the Articles of the Church; and in his general practice as a Christian, he was punctual and exact almost to a proverb.'¹⁶ George Burnett belongs to a band of forgotten men who played no inconsiderable part in the Evangelical Revival. He deserves to be a little more than a name. These scanty notes may perhaps stimulate more fruitful inquiry.

A. SKEVINGTON WOOD

¹ *Letters of John Wesley* (Standard Edn, ed. J. Telford), IV. 235-9. *Journal of John Wesley* (Standard Edn, ed. N. Curnock), V. 60-2. In a draft letter to the travelling preachers dated 4th August 1769 Wesley refers to the number of Evangelical clergy who received his circular as 'fifty or sixty' (*Letters*, V. 144). This latter figure was given to the Leeds Conference of 1769 (*Minutes*, I.87-9). cf. my article, 'Three Evangelicals', in *W.H.S.Proceedings*, XXVIII 105.

² J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses—1715-1886*, p.195.

³ He is said by Samuel Walker to have graduated Master of Arts in the University of Aberdeen prior to his arrival in Cornwall, but the registers record nothing at this period. A George Burnett graduated at Marischal College, Aberdeen, on 17th April 1765. No further particulars are given and it is not therefore possible to make a certain identification. I am grateful to Dr W. D. Simpson, Librarian of Aberdeen University, for consulting the registers. G. C. B. Davies, in his careful, though not quite comprehensive, account of Burnett in *The Early Cornish Evangelicals* (published after the preparation of the present article) quotes the letter from Walker to Adam in which reference is made to the degree, without inquiring into the accuracy of the claim (p. 180). In his recent book, *The Early Evangelicals*, Dr L. E. Elliott-Binns accepts Burnett's M.A. without query, comment, or citation of authority (p. 320).

⁴ G. C. Boase, *Collectanea Cornubiensia*, p.122. *Christian Guardian* (1811), p.202. 'In Cornwall where I first was made acquainted with Christ and with my dear friend Mr Rawlings of Padstow: from the year 1749 to the year 1757' (Letter to William Rawlings, 10th August 1781).

⁵ R. Polwhele, *History of Cornwall*, V.64n.

⁶ MS Autobiography of Thomas Haweis, p.14. Quoted by permission of the Trustees of the Mitchell Library, Sydney, New South Wales.

⁷ cf. J. Morison, *Fathers and Founders of L.M.S.*, II.170-207.

⁸ Haweis Autobiography, p. 22. Dr Elliott-Binns (op. cit., p.320) betrays his unacquaintance with the facts when he asserts that Burnett did not come under the influence of Walker until after his residence at Oxford. Apart from the determinative evidence provided by the Haweis Autobiography, the letters of Walker to Rawlings, of 16th December 1755 (E. Sidney, *Life of Samuel Walker*, pp.275-6), and to Adam, of 10th May 1756 (ibid., p.199), make it clear that Walker was personally associated with Burnett before the latter went to Oxford. Even the erratic Seymour succeeds in recording the sequence of events correctly (op. cit., I.276n.). Elliott-Binns, however, places Burnett's meeting with Walker in the period of the Padstow curacy, which, as we shall see, is itself open to question.

- ⁹ J. Foster, op. cit., p.195.
- ¹⁰ E. Sidney, *Life of Samuel Walker* (2nd Edn), pp.275-6.
- ¹¹ Haweis Autobiography, p.27. ¹² E. Sidney, op. cit., p.199.
- ¹³ William Bassett, Vicar of Glentworth, Lincolnshire, 1729-65; Archdeacon of Stow, 1751-65. (J. Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, I. i. 104.)
- ¹⁴ E. Sidney, op. cit., p.325. ¹⁵ *ibid.*, pp.328-9. ¹⁶ *ibid.*, p.339.
- ¹⁷ A. Westoby, *Memoir of Adam*, p.58; *Christian Observer* (1877), p.176. Joseph Jane was Vicar of St Mary Magdalene, Oxford, from 1748 to 1763. (*Diocese of Oxford Ordinations, etc.*, 1737-1802, Bodleian MSS.) He was a friend of Walker and secured a title for Haweis.
- ¹⁸ Letter from Walker to Adam, 8th December 1757. (E. Sidney, op. cit., pp.410-11.)
- ¹⁹ The Bishop of Wells from 1743 to 1774 was Edward Willes (cf. J. le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, I.140). Burnett was in the vicinity of Bath in September 1757. Haweis wrote to Martha Tregenna at Bath on 14th September: 'Mr Burnett is in the neighbourhood. I wish he may visit you, though I fear he does not know of your lodgings' (MS Letter in Mitchell Library, Sydney).
- ²⁰ Isaac Maddox, Bishop of Worcester 1743-59 (cf. J. le Neve, op. cit., III.68).
- ²¹ T. Wills, *Spiritual Register*, III.29; cf. also letter from Conon to Burnett of 19th June 1766, where he refers in retrospect to his bad treatment (*ibid.*, p.34).
- ²² E. Sidney, op. cit., p.410. ²³ *ibid.*, p.423. ²⁴ *ibid.* ²⁵ *ibid.*, pp.452-5.
- ²⁶ I. 276n. ²⁷ J. Foster, op. cit., p.1178. ²⁸ op. cit., II.4n. I am glad to find that Davies (op. cit., p.183) and Elliott-Binns (op. cit., p.158) confirm this exposure of Seymour's inaccuracy. Is the former correct, however, in placing the birth of the Rev. William Rawlings in the year 1760? Rawlings was baptized at St Columb on 3rd June 1761 (G. C. Boase, op. cit., p.787) and matriculated from Exeter College, Oxford, on 11th March 1780, aged eighteen (J. Foster, op. cit., p.1178).
- ²⁹ G. C. Boase, op. cit., pp.787-8. ³⁰ E. Sidney, op. cit., p.476. ³¹ *ibid.*, p.487.
- ³² *ibid.*, p.493. ³³ *ibid.*, p.490.
- ³⁴ *ibid.*, pp.276-7; cf. also a letter from Adam to Burnett, 27th June 1760: 'I hear you are labouring hard, in conjunction with Mr Venn, to whom I desire my best respects. Go on, and the blessings of God go along with you. Keep a watchful eye on the risings of pride. It will beset you on all occasions, and success or disappointment, evil report or good report, will add fuel to it' (A. Westoby, op. cit., p.65).
- ³⁵ *Life and Letters of Henry Venn* (ed. H. Venn), pp.81-2.
- ³⁶ E. Sidney, op. cit., p.512. ³⁷ H. Venn, op. cit., p.85.
- ³⁸ 'A candid inquirer after the truth', according to John Wesley (*Journal*, III.16).
- ³⁹ E. Sidney, op. cit., p.545; T. Wills, op. cit., pp.2-4. ⁴⁰ E. Sidney, op. cit., p.554.
- ⁴¹ E. Sidney, *Life of Sir Richard Hill*, pp.93-4. The following receipt is to be found in the Elland Parish Register under the year 1772: 'Received of Mr George Burnett, Curate of the parochial chapelry of Elland the sum of £40, which is for five years the sum of £8 a year which my family have usually paid to the Curate for reading prayers in the Church and which Mr Burnett did not choose to do for the money and therefore desired it might be given to the Charity School at Elland and for which I will pay 40s. per annum as long as the money remains in my hand. Signed—Thos. Thornhill. George Burnett, Minister.' In the *Elland Parish Magazine* for August 1950, the Rector, the Rev. Bernard C. Pawley, to whom I am indebted for this excerpt from the Registers, discusses the explanation of the receipt. He rules out the possibility that Burnett did not consider the sum sufficient. 'It could then mean', he continues, 'that he was not willing to be obliged by this monetary agreement to recite the daily services; or that he objected to the daily services themselves.' In view of Burnett's staunch Churchmanship, the latter seems hardly probable. It would appear rather that his conscience would not permit him to benefit from what he regarded as part of his duty as Curate.
- ⁴² *Letters*, IV.215.
- ⁴³ E. Sidney, *Life of Samuel Walker*, p.493.
- ⁴⁴ cf. A. W. Harrison, *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion*, p.111.
- ⁴⁵ *An Affectionate Address to the Members of the Methodist Societies* (1795) (*Letters*, IV.214).
- ⁴⁶ Letter of John Wesley to Ebenezer Blackwell apropos of the Huddersfield situation (*Letters*, IV.160).
- ⁴⁷ *ibid.*, p.215. ⁴⁸ *ibid.* ⁴⁹ I.44-7. ⁵⁰ op. cit., II.6.
- ⁵¹ H. Venn, op. cit., p.477.
- ⁵² G. R. Balleine, *History of the Evangelical Party*, (1951 Edn) p.64.
- ⁵³ 29th March 1782. *Historical MSS Commission*, 15th Report, Appendix I, III.256-7.
- ⁵⁴ William Farish (1759-1837), of Magdalen College; Professor of Chemistry, 1794-1813; Jacksonian Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy and Chemistry, 1817-37 (J. le Neve, op. cit., III.663, 666.)
- ⁵⁵ Joseph Jowett, LL.D (1752-1813), of Trinity Hall; Regius Professor of Civil Law, 1782-1813 (*ibid.*, p.658). 'A close friend of Isaac Milner' (*Christian Observer* (1813), pp.820-4).
- ⁵⁶ The ecclesiastical historian of the Revival, whose *magnum opus* Archbishop Brilioth describes as 'one of the most important monuments we possess of Lutheran influence on English ground' (*The Anglican Revival*, p.35).
- ⁵⁷ D.N.B. 1937-8 Edn, XII.1090.)
- ⁵⁸ Polwhele, op. cit., p.64n. Conon moved to Padstow in 1771 (T. Wills, op. cit., p.30).
- ⁵⁹ A. Westoby, op. cit., pp.115ff. Adam died on 12th March 1784 (*Christian Observer* (1812), p.19).
- ⁶⁰ *Evangelical Magazine* (1793), p.83; *Gentleman's Magazine* (1793), II.676.

Recent Literature

Edited by C. RYDER SMITH

The Life and Ministry of Jesus, by Vincent Taylor. (Macmillan, 16s.).

This is an enlarged version of the author's article with the same title in Volume VII of the *Interpreter's Bible*. Six valuable chapters of Prolegomena are new. The remaining chapters correspond in the main with the sections of the article mentioned (which we may call Proto-Taylor), but while the bulk of the original matter is reproduced in a revised form, it is amplified with a good deal of additional material. The book keeps in general to the Markan framework, but not slavishly. It is recognized that there are topical sections which probably existed in connected cycles before Mark wrote his Gospel, such as the conflict stories of 2:1—3:6. Moreover, the Markan sequence is supplemented from the other Gospels; and here the Fourth Gospel, with its witness to a substantial Jerusalem ministry, is brought into the picture. It is suggested that the incidents which Mark places in the last week actually occupied a longer period; and that Jesus was in Judea from the time of the Feast of Dedication, as in John 10:41.

Great importance is attached to the Mission of the Twelve. The message with which they were entrusted was an eschatological call to Israel. It will be remembered that Schweitzer made much of this, and on the basis of Matthew 10:23 said that Jesus expected the Parousia before the Twelve had completed their Mission; when the expectation was not fulfilled He withdrew to the region of Tyre greatly puzzled, and came to the conclusion that He must Himself suffer before the Kingdom could come. Dr Taylor, while holding that at this stage the term 'Son of man' stood for the Elect Community rather than an individual figure, takes over Schweitzer's main point. With this modified interpretation he quotes Schweitzer's words, 'the disciples returned to him; and the appearing of the Son of man had not taken place'; and continues: 'But the failure was immensely fruitful.' 'The consummation looked for had not happened.' God, it seems, had not acted in the way anticipated. When, however, we ask what it was that Jesus expected, we are given the somewhat ambiguous words, 'the setting up of the Messianic Community', the Parousia of the (communal) Son of man. What exactly does this mean? We should have liked fuller light on its precise character, particularly as elsewhere the Elect Community is connected with the little flock which the ministry of Jesus had brought into being. Any attempt to give a full account of the Teaching of Jesus is disclaimed. In the *Interpreter's Bible* a section of equal length by other contributors was devoted to the Teaching; but Dr Taylor keeps fairly narrowly to his original limits. Most of the questions involved are dealt with more fully and critically in his magnificent commentary on Mark; but this slenderer work helps us to grasp the outlines of the story and skilfully brings events into focus.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

The Vision and Mission of Jesus, by A. H. Curtis. (T. & T. Clark, 21s.).

This is a most unusual and suggestive study of the Life of Jesus and of the origin and basis of the Christian Mission. The book finds the key of interpretation in the twin stories of the Temptation and Resurrection and concentrates upon the element of vision found in these incidents, both as regards Jesus Himself and His immediate disciples. At His Baptism, it is argued, Jesus, after the manner of the Old Testament prophets, received a unique revelation of the Holy Spirit and a commission which drove Him out into the wilderness to be tempted by an opposing spirit. This experience 'resulted in a conception of the rule of God which fused in a peculiar way the great beliefs in the divine righteousness and sovereignty which He inherited from the Hebrew past'. 'The righteousness and the sovereign initiative of God are to be expressed, not in a more favourable future, but now, in the ministry of righteous and vicarious suffering for men's

sins.' The same righteousness, it is maintained, and the initiative which expresses itself in holy suffering now, 'will, however, vindicate itself both to believers and unbelievers in a final judgement when, in the expressive New Testament phrase, God shall judge the secrets of all hearts'. The teaching by parables, the mission of the Son of Man, the stories of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Raising of Lazarus, the Apocalyptic Discourse in Mark 13, the Passion and Resurrection are all studied from this point of view in a penetrating analysis in which special emphasis is laid upon the reception of God's revelation in Christ in meekness and faith.

The book is provided with learned appendices, but is intended for the ordinary reader as well as for the scholar. It cannot be said that it is easy to read. The author's style is subtle and involved. Sentences from fifteen to seventeen lines long are common, and there is much repetition of the main themes. A first reading may discourage the reader, but he will be well advised to read the book a second time, as the reviewer has done with much profit to himself. Apart from the style, the difficulty of the book is the author's unusual approach to the problems of New Testament origins. The critical spirit is subsumed under the spiritual insight with which the author deals with his vital themes. To a marked degree the book combines historical criticism, a kind of prefiguration in which Old Testament types illumine New Testament stories, and a form of interpretation which recalls in many ways the ancient patristic commentators. Not all Professor Curtis's judgements will carry conviction, particularly as regards Mark's methods, the use Matthew makes of Mark, and the character of the Johannine narratives; but everywhere the reader is challenged by new insights, in particular, into such sayings as 'The Kingdom of God is within you' (Lk 17^{ss}), 'You will not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come' (Mt 10^{ss}), and the central character of the Parable of the Sower (Mk 4^{ss}). This is a book that breaks new ground. A sentence like the following well indicates the character of the main argument: 'Our conclusion to which we have already cumulatively spoken and are now further to speak is therefore that the origin of the historic Mission of Jesus and of the Church of the New Testament (for whoever has ears) is the determinative revelation of the character and will of God through the experience of what the Bible calls Vision.'

VINCENT TAYLOR

The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls, by A. Dupont-Sommer, translated from the French by R. D. Barnett. (Valentine, Mitchell & Co., 10s. 6d.)

As is well known, fresh discoveries continue to be made under 'The Dead Sea Scrolls', and any book on the subject is likely to be put out of date very quickly. The French edition of the present work contains a postscript dealing with some of the newer finds. For the English translation, that postscript had to be rewritten and expanded. Nothing that has come to light, however, has caused Dupont-Sommer to make any serious change in his views. He argues at length in defence of his identification of the Kittim with the Romans, and gives a much fuller account of the community from which the Scrolls come, identifying it, as before, with the Essenes. The publication of the text of the *Manual of Discipline* has made possible this more detailed description; and the reader has the advantage of having set out at length translations of the relevant passages from the Pseudepigrapha, the *Zadokite Document*, Josephus, and Philo, as well as from the *Manual* itself. In an examination of the system of seasons and the significance of numbers, the writer adduces fresh arguments for the influence of Pythagoreanism on the sect; and in the doctrine of the Two Spirits, he finds reflections of the teaching of the Gāthās.

What Dupont-Sommer wrote in his earlier book about the relationship between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus has been sharply criticized. He now rebuts these strictures, pointing out, with justice, that they were based on inaccurate citations of his views. While rejecting Teicher's contention that the sect of the Scrolls was Ebionite, he holds that primitive Christianity was similar to (not identical with) Essenism, and that,

therefore, these documents are of great importance for the study of Christian origins. This is undoubtedly one of the most valuable books about the Scrolls; and even if the reader does not always concur in its conclusions, he will find it informative and stimulating. The translation is, for the most part, smooth and accurate. The reviewer has noticed minor mistranslations and slips of other kinds on pp. 76, 79, 85, 93, 95, 96, 102, 105, 110, 118, 121, 142, 155, 156, 167, 176 and 178.

G. W. ANDERSON

Leaders of Early Christian Thought, by S. H. Mellone. (Lindsey Press, 15s.)

The scope of this interesting and able book is hardly indicated by its title. The author has in fact written a survey of the history of doctrine up to A.D. 451 and given us a series of chapters on the development of Christian thought on such subjects as the Nature of God and Man, the Person and Work of Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Trinity, the Church, Ministry, and Sacraments. He does not try to fly any party flags. On the whole he sees the doctrinal development which took place in the main stream of the Church's thought as necessary and justified. The controversies were of vital concern. While recognizing the debt we all owe to Harnack's brilliant survey of the whole field, he cannot agree with that great teacher's thesis that the history of Christian doctrine was determined by an alien philosophical method and an illegitimate growth of ecclesiastical authority whereby the Gospel of Jesus was changed from its original form. Dr Mellone finds this unsatisfactory, largely because it is 'profoundly pessimistic'. The essence of his own point of view would seem to be indicated in the following quotation: 'It is true that there has been a real spiritual danger emerging from age to age in the history of Christianity; but its sources have had nothing to do with the influences of philosophy on the Gospel. As time went on, more stress was laid on the *stated content* of the faith than on faith as an inner habit of mind.' This appears to the present reviewer to be taking the anti-Harnack reaction too far, and in view of Nygren's analysis of the motifs at work in the early Church, insufficiently penetrating. But this does not detract from the value of the book as a whole, since it is only incidental to its main contents and purpose. An excellent feature is the large number of pertinent quotations from the Fathers themselves (St Augustine in particular), and the reader will find it rewarding to pursue the references given in the Appendix to the original sources, and to a number of recent monographs on the various points discussed. In some instances the latter list could have been extended. As already indicated, one misses any reference to Nygren, and a study of Prof. R. V. Sellers' recent work might require the chapters on the Person of Christ to be modified. In general the treatment is rather more advanced than in some of the smaller text-books now in common use. The book could be used by students (of all ages) with profit. They would probably be impressed with the fact (if they had not realized it before) that many of our present-day theological problems were also the main concern of the early Fathers of the Church, who wrestled with them, as we do now (cf. especially Chapter 1 on the Interpretation of Scripture).

NORMAN P. GOLDHAWK

Calvin: Theological Treatises, translated with Introductions and Notes by J. K. S. Reid. (S.C.M. Library of Christian Classics, 30s.)

It is at first sight strange to find a work devoted to Calvin's 'Theological Treatises' which does not contain the 'Institutes'; but the 'Institutes' are fairly cheaply available, and editions of Calvin's other theological work are rare. We have learnt recently that we ought not to judge Calvin or his theology by the 'Institutes' alone, but must take the 'Commentaries' too very carefully into account. Now Professor Reid reminds us that the complete picture cannot be obtained without calling into evidence at least some of the 'occasional' theological writings with which Calvin tirelessly reinforced his position and propagated the Reformation. Here we have Calvinism applied to particular situations—explicitly stated as the *rationale* and means of reform; apologetically stated to convince men of reason and religion; controversially stated to refute detractors, cavillers, and

obstructionists; translated into ecclesiastical legislation to order the lives and opinions of ordinary believers in town and countryside. But in every guise it is the same Calvinism, bearing the imprint of the same master-mind and confirmed by the same massive arguments as those with which the 'Institutes' have made us familiar.

Not all the works here presented are the unaided work of Calvin himself. Some of those concerned with the regulation of Church life are the product of committees—of which Calvin was, no doubt, the most influential member. Of very particular interest is the 'Catechism of the Church of Geneva', which is probably Calvin's from beginning to end, and was intended for the instruction of children in the faith. It is not exactly in the form which we expect of a catechism, since for long stretches it is virtually a dialogue between the minister and the child, in which the minister often states a doctrine for the child to accept; but the main principles of the Reformed faith are stated with unexampled lucidity and brevity. The chief theological interest of the volume comes in Calvin's expositions of the doctrines of the Lord's Supper and predestination against those who held other views. On the Lord's Supper he takes a mediating and attractively irenic line. On predestination, as when he refutes the 'calumnies of a certain worthless person' (i.e. Castellio), he is unbending and vituperative, indicating that he has no use for compromising thinkers who hold that God permits, but does not decree, the things that we call evil, or that God foreknows the future without predestining it. The translations, almost all original, are clear and compact. The general introduction does not give us much more than the reasons for selecting the works which appear in this very welcome volume.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

The Pure in Heart, the Cato Lecture of 1954, by W. E. Sangster. (The Epworth Press, 18s. 6d.)

Methodists are rightly giving increasing attention to their 'grand depositum', the doctrine of Christian perfection; and Dr Sangster here follows his earlier study in *The Path to Perfection* with a wider survey, a broad presentation of the practice of holiness, exemplified in the saints of all communions, and exhibiting always the same general family likeness. The first section of the book outlines clearly and concisely the development of 'the idea of the holy' in the Old and New Testaments and inter-testamental literature; and it raises an important question. Whereas in the Old Testament holiness is confined to the few, after Pentecost all who have received the Holy Spirit, all Christians, are called 'saints'; but in modern usage the term is once again limited to the few, to those rare souls who have actually lived lives of 'heroic virtue'. Why this change? Why this seeming return to a pre-Pentecostal conception? Has the word been given a heightened connotation? Or has the level of life in the Church fallen? Dr Sangster sees the change beginning in the sub-apostolic age with the acceptance of a double standard of virtue and neglect of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Roman Catholic Church has tended to retain the double standard, and to see only in the contemplative life the way of sanctity. Protestants, on the other hand, have refused to define the saint, because they have doubted the possibility of recognizing him, and have also believed that the Christian is saved rather *in sinning* than *from sinning*. Not all, we feel, would be able to accept this contention without further qualification. Nor does the rest of the book give an altogether clear answer to the question raised earlier. As a good Methodist, Dr Sangster insists that holiness is for all, and he recognizes that Paul used the word 'saint' of people who obviously fell short of Christian perfection; but when he comes to paint a composite portrait of the saint, illustrated with historical examples, the word still seems to be used with the sub-apostolic meaning, and to be confined to the few, those in whose lives every one of the fruits of the Spirit is manifested, almost as if holiness were only the final prize and not also the first germinal possession of the Christian life. Yet such an emphasis was perhaps inevitable in a study of this kind, and certainly no one will read these vivid chapters unmoved. Here is a warm compelling plea for growth in holiness, a plea enforced and

illuminated by illustrations drawn from the whole of the Church's vast and varied pageantry of sainthood, from Tikhon Zadonsky to Sadhu Sundar Singh, from the Curé d'Ars to Fletcher of Madeley. All who read this book will be grateful for its exhilarating challenge to 'press on to the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus'.

G. ERNEST LONG

Are we blind also?, by B. C. Plowright. (Nisbet, 12s. 6d.)

Authority and Freedom, by R. H. Thouless. (Hodder & Stoughton, 8s. 6d.)

Mr. Plowright writes with deep conviction and with much practical insight into the contemporary situation. He believes that the main problem facing the Church today is how it can be reborn so as to become an effective means of the redemption of our time. The lesson of redemptive history is that if the people of God refuse to answer the need of their time, God will form for Himself a new people. When the clamant public need was authority and unity to replace the crumbling order of the Roman Empire, the Medieval Church met that need with its conception of the unity and authority of the Holy Roman Empire. When the urgent public need was the opportunity to develop the growing nationalism of the later Middle ages, the Reformed churches met it with their emphasis on personal faith and their breaking of the shackles of the old order. The need of our time is to reconcile authority and freedom, in political and more personal spheres, and the Church must meet this need or be replaced. This may be done by the Church becoming more involved in the total life of modern man, for redemption is always through involvement. The book is clearer in diagnosis of the malady than in prescription of a cure, but it is a valuable study of the problems of the Church in this age of transition. There is, however, insufficient emphasis on the need for unity among the people of God, for is not the most serious example of blindness today to be found in the refusal to face the scandal of a divided Church?

In the Hulsean Lectures of 1952 Dr Thouless writes as an Anglican layman who is keenly interested in the problems of the faith of modern man. He believes that part of the present decline in religious faith, especially among the more intellectual members of society, is due to difficulties of dogma. Some of these difficulties can be overcome by those who are seeking faith. Dr Thouless demolishes in a kindly but devastating way the common objection about 'refusing to be fettered by an outworn creed', and rejects the popular notion that it is a revision of language which is required to make the Creeds intelligible, with the observation that modern philosophical terms would be no less remote from modern man than are the Athanasian formulae. On the other hand, the Church must cease to make unnecessary dogmatic claims on those who wish to embrace the faith, and only a minimum of doctrine should be obligatory on any individual. A large part of Christian doctrine should be regarded as 'orthodox non-essential'—i.e. as officially believed by the Church but not imposed on individuals as a condition of membership. While much of the detailed argument applies specifically to the Church of England, the book is a most valuable discussion of the place of dogma in religion. One has the feeling that Dr Thouless would find the attitude of Methodism to dogma much more congenial than that of his own Church, and we ought to rejoice in Wesley's refusal to impose a credal test on his converts, while insisting on a close control over the official teaching of his helpers. This is an admirably courageous book, with a lucidity which gains considerably from the author's sympathetic understanding of faith, based on his well-known effectiveness as a teacher of philosophy.

WILLIAM STRAWSON

Dilemmas, by Gilbert Ryle. (Cambridge University, 10s. 6d.)

This book contains the Tarnier Lectures given last year at Cambridge, by a well-known Oxford philosopher. The audience in view is much less the specialized student than the educated reader who would like to be initiated into a philosophical view-point. The publisher's blurb, unworthy of a university press, puts the matter in a way that is less

than fair to the author: 'The only intellectual equipment required—besides an interest in the differences between good and specious arguments—is a taste for witty and stylish exposition.' There certainly is academic wit and plenty of stylishness, but these are not carrots to attract donkeys: they are so tied up with hard thinking that they could not be savoured by anyone mentally unstretched. The theme is intensely interesting and valuable: can we solve, or otherwise see through, certain conflicts of very general concern, some of theory with theory and some of theory with common sense? For example, from the side of science we have been worried by determinism, by accounts of matter that seem to deny most of its experienced properties, and by accounts of the mechanism of sense-perception that seem to undermine our postulate that the senses tell us about an external world. Or again, some philosophers have bothered us by arguing that in conduct all that matters is pleasure; and Zeno's paradoxes have long made nonsense of our common ideas about motion. Professor Ryle examines these conflicts with flair and freshness. He calls them 'dilemmas' because each side has its own cogency. His general answer is that such conflicts usually indicate cross-purposes, since the two sides are not really giving rival answers to the same question, but are approaching different questions with a different set of basic ideas. In his introductory chapter he suggests that this is the situation with regard to some of the strains between science and theology. Within the limits of space he has expounded his view with remarkable skill, giving an illuminating introduction to a philosophical technique which he has taught to a large part of the younger British students and teachers of philosophy. Even those of us who disagree deeply with him about the function of philosophy can enjoy and profit by this book.

T. E. JESSOP

Nature, Mind and Modern Science, by Errol E. Harris. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 35s.)

For the greater part of a generation now British philosophy has been moving away from metaphysics toward analysis. Latterly the analysis has been linguistic. Philosophers have discussed, not perception, but the behaviour of the verb 'to see', not freedom, but the uses of the word 'free', not personal identity, but the status of the word 'self'. The general tendency of this stream of linguistic analysis has been markedly reductionist. It had long been noted that although the function of a noun is to stand for an object, not every noun is in fact supported by a separate item of reality. But now, as the result of a more radical use of this principle, some of the basic objects of metaphysics are being dismissed as type-fallacies. For example, 'mind' (as analysed by Professor Ryle) stands, not for a persisting entity, but for a logical construction out of the various occurrent 'mental' activities; and 'God' (as analysed by Professor Wisdom) stands, not for an existing supernatural Being, but for a logical construction out of a particular style of experiencing life. Analysis here takes the form of the reduction or dissolution of supposed entities into events of a lower logical order from which they are said to have been constructed in thought.

In this book, Professor E. E. Harris, of the University of the Witwatersrand, combats this recent development in philosophy. He uses as his chief weapon of attack the modes of thought required by modern science, which rest, he argues, upon conceptions which are ultimately holistic and evolutionary, and incompatible with the reductionist procedures. Thus he commends the last of our philosophical system-builders, Alexander and Whitehead, as surer guides than the linguistic analysts. The central bulk of his book is a review of the history of Western philosophy from the early Greeks until today, the purpose of which is to trace the growth of modern empiricism and to attack it at each stage of its development. This historical section is preceded and followed by shorter discussions of some leading representatives of the school of thought which the writer is criticizing. The weakness of such a plan is that it results in too much skirmishing with the enemy's outposts and too little direct hand-to-hand fighting with his main forces. Consequently, whilst the book is admirably clear and cogent in detail, its overall impact is less decisive.

JOHN H. HICK

The Nature of Human Personality, by G. N. M. Tyrell. (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.)

This, the last of Mr Tyrell's books upon psychical research, was almost complete at the time of his death, and now appears with a preface by Professor H. H. Price. It embraces some further evidence of psychical phenomena, but its chief aim, and also interest, is in an attempt to estimate the significance of the evidence already before us. It insists that paranormal phenomena are based on powers all possess, though unequally. Because they do not fit in with our normal life, we are hostile and suspicious toward them. In the writer's own words: 'Paranormal experiences are not isolated into one separate category, while religious experiences are isolated in another, and at the same time the experiences of daily life are cut off and separate from both.' He holds that all experiences are interwoven, and separated only by our way of looking at them and our suspicion of anything unfamiliar. Early man literally lived by his wits. They helped him to survive in the struggle for existence against foes, both animate and inanimate, which were far more powerful than himself. It is very hard to shake off this practical function of mind, which, as far as the actual business of living is concerned, serves us sufficiently. As Mr Tyrell puts it: 'The whole world, the whole universe, is as simple as ABC so long as we don't ask questions about it.' That may explain the prejudice against investigations which seem to upset our comfortable known world. One scientist who was vastly impressed with Dr Rhine's work refused to let it be known, for fear he would lose caste with his fellows. It is not too much to say that science as a whole refuses to give any impartial examination to the paranormal. To which the reply would probably be that the paranormal lends itself to no scientific kind of investigation. Like the wind, it bloweth where it listeth. 'We feel that we are greater than we know.' Wordsworth never wrote a line more true than that. The paranormal is felt rather than known. It does not lend itself to our measures, refusing scientific vivisection. Yet it *is*. No one can read Mr Tyrell's book impartially and doubt it.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

I who Am, a Study of the Self, by Lawrence Hyde. (Omega Press, Reigate, 15s.)

There is no more important tension in modern thought than that between psychology and religion. In consequence of the lamentable breakdown and devaluation of religious symbols which afflicts the modern man, the understanding and experience of the spiritual world must be rebuilt from the ground up as far as he is concerned. He has an intuition that this can be done somehow in the common field between psychology and religion. It is into this critical but perilous and confused field that Lawrence Hyde courageously enters in this book. Having shown, as others have done, the limitations of the scientific approach to the understanding of ultimate reality, he moves to the criticism of the psychological approach, and especially to the consideration of Jung. While he pays tribute to the value of the pioneer work of this psychologist, he regards his refusal to commit himself on metaphysics and his insistence on 'psychological truth' as against the material truth of the outside world, as producing the impression that spiritual realities are merely subjective, inward apprehensions and not solid facts. While this may be a common impression, it does not seem to be correct. Jung's phrase 'the objective psychic' is enough to show that he believes in the reality of what is within the unconscious *psyche*. His business as a psychologist is to examine it where it occurs, within the personality. It is for others to relate his concepts to a new metaphysic. A reality can be both inward and objective. Nevertheless, Hyde's contention that man's deepest life moves in the midst of spiritual powers has its value. But when he comes to outline the religion suited to modern man, it is obvious that he owes more to Eastern philosophy than Christianity, even though he admits that the latter brought the sense of the value of the individual into the world and emphasizes the Christian values of Wisdom and Love. He believes in the existence of a hierarchy of spiritual powers with which man can get into touch by discipline and reflection. He teaches what he calls 'the Doctrine of the Life Ray' by means of which souls in the same spiritual situation or with spiritual affinities, are tuned, as it were,

to the same wave-length. He thus reaches a view of the universe in which there is a wonderful society of souls, graded and attuned to each other, who can move by reflection and discipline ever onward to new states and conditions. This lovely vision has its fascination, but does not Christianity provide something more vital to help man than any philosophy? It involves a philosophy, of course—and it is this that needs stating afresh.

ERASTUS EVANS

Christians and Christianity in India and Pakistan, by P. Thomas. (George Allen & Unwin, 18s.)

This attempt to put into perspective the history of Christianity in India is perhaps most useful as providing a sketch of the period before the coming of the Portuguese. The claim of the Malabar Christians that their church was founded by the Apostle Thomas is here elaborated uncritically, and one doubts whether 'the probabilities are that St Thomas gave the primitive Indian church a simple Dravidian liturgy which they could understand and appreciate'. Another Thomas, a prosperous and very influential 'Father of the nation' in the fourth century, probably brought the name into use. It is true, however, that for a thousand years Nestorian Bishops maintained the connexion between Antioch and the Syrian Church of South India, even when the advancing Muslim power almost severed it. Rome tried hard to effect union through Jesuit labour, but was resisted by independent Jacobite schism. Modern Protestant missions have stimulated local vigour and reduced the influence of Syria, on the Malabar Church, which was always restive under Western authorities and never convincingly Nestorian. The collapse of the Roman Madura mission is a sample of many abortive missions to India, but the devotion of the saintly Xavier, the 'good padre' Schwartz, the energetic Carey, the impetuous zealot Martyn, and more obscure men and women overcame the prejudice against the Westerners. This part of the story, as here told, is balanced and is not flattering to the British. How tangled the political and religious threads were in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is colourfully illustrated by the vivid North Indian romance of the low-born Muslim girl who used her beauty, wits, and political sagacity to become 'the Christian Princess of Sardhana'. As the Begum Samru in her struggle with the British she played her cards cleverly and by her lavish gifts enhanced the fame of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1814 the English Government lifted the ban on missions and the next century, in spite of political tension, saw the rapid development of social and educational missions all over India. 'The political struggle that culminated in Indian independence in 1947 had none of the undesirable elements of the mutiny of 1857 and was conducted on both sides in a truly Christian spirit.' There are now more than eight million Indian Christians and the Church of South India gives promise of further union and co-ordination.

G. STANTON MORRIS

Church of South India, The Movement Toward Union, 1900-47, by Bengt Sundkler. (Lutterworth Press, 25s.)

Professor Sundkler has given us a book not only of careful scholarship but also of absorbing interest. The story of long-drawn negotiations in a distant land over a period of twenty-eight years, involving many subtle theological and other problems, might have been of almost unreadable dullness; but the analytical skill of Prof. Sundkler and his vivid and penetrating pictures of the leaders of the movement carry the reader with fascinated attention right through the book. He writes from an advantageous position of disinterestedness in the theological and other problems that occupied the mind of the Joint Committee in South India; he is not a member of any of the Churches directly involved, but of the Church of Sweden; he is Professor of Missions, Uppsala University, and late Research Secretary, International Missionary Council. He visited India in 1950-1, and thus was able to see the life of the Church of South India within three or four years of its inauguration. He has had access not only to all published documents and

to the archives of missionary societies, but also to much private correspondence; he has had interviews with many of the major and minor actors in the drama which is his subject, and has picked their brains with inquisitorial thoroughness. He has sifted this great mass of material with discrimination, and from it has produced a consistent and convincing story. Not the least valuable part of the book is the lengthy section of notes at the end, giving not only detailed references for statements made in the text, but also many illuminating additional comments. Not every reader will agree with all his judgments on men and things, but he is always fair, and from his detached position, with the wealth of new material at his disposal and viewing the movement as a whole, he is able to make plain what was not always clear to those who were in the thick of the discussions. He does well to give generous space—his first ninety pages—to the years before the famous Tranquebar Conference of 1919, showing the trends that had made it possible. In his preface he defends the more summary treatment of the period 1941-7; but perhaps the book would have been better balanced if a fuller treatment of those difficult years had been possible.

In the book as a whole he captures something of the sense of exhilaration, of being swept along in the stream of the Divine purpose, to which so many of those who took part in the discussions have borne witness, and which is still so clear a note in the Church of South India. (Marcus Ward's account of the first five years of the life of the Church, 'The Pilgrim Church', brings this out very plainly.) This is beyond question the most valuable book that has appeared on the subject, and is most relevant to the discussions that are taking place on union on a world scale.

J. S. M. HOOPER

A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948, edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill. (S.P.C.K., 32s. 6d.)

The publication of an authentic history of the Ecumenical movement answers a widespread demand. And authentic it is. Among the authors there are two highly respected veterans of the first generation, Dr. Ruth Rouse and Canon Tissington Tatlow. The same mark of authenticity is found both in the chapters about *Life and Work* by two Swedish authors, Dean N. Karlström of Skara and Dr N. Ehrenström, and in the contributions of the officers of the movement, Canon O. S. Tomkins, in his chapter on 'The Roman Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Movement, 1910-48'; Bishop Neill in dealing with the formation of the Church of South-India and in his thoughtful Epilogue; and Dr W. A. Visser 't Hooft in his chapter on 'The Genesis of the World Council of Churches'. The editors have also secured the services of leading authorities on special subjects, such as Prof. Norman Sykes on 'Ecumenical Movements in Great Britain in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries' and Prof. Latourette on 'Ecumenical Bearings of the Missionary Movement and the International Missionary Council'. The Ecumenical contribution of the Eastern Churches is described in two chapters by Dean G. Florovsky and Dr N. Zernov. In his chapter on 'Ecumenical Activity on the Continent of Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries' Prof. Martin Schmidt of the Berlin *Kirchliche Hochschule* is able to make use of materials gathered by Prof. F. Blanke of Zürich. To many of us fresh ground is broken by Prof. D. H. Yoder's contribution on 'Christian Unity in Nineteenth-century America'. One half of the book deals with the period before 1910, when Bishop Brent conceived the idea of the *Faith and Order* movement, and the other to the much more momentous development since that date. There is no room to complete the list of subjects and authors. The ambit of the subjects is wide, and the writers are experts from various lands.

As far as possible, overlapping has been avoided by a careful system of cross-references. There are chapters that are little master-pieces. There are a number of brief, but precious characterizations of some of the heroes of the past. As everywhere, different classes of readers will appreciate different things. Above all, this symposium is a mine of information, solid and reliable throughout. The specialist will find so much food for thought

that he is not likely to grumble at what is included or omitted. The present reviewer would have been glad if the close parallel between the Tractarian Movement, with its revival of what had seemed obsolete for a long period, and analogous developments both in the Roman and Reformation Churches, had been drawn out more clearly. The more deeply we enter into ecumenical discussions in the warmer climate of today, the more we become conscious of our peculiar denominational treasures, but this fits us better for our common task, as is shown, for instance, by Bishop Neill's full report on the negotiations leading to intercommunion between the Anglican and Swedish Churches. Here he rightly quotes the very thorough statement of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden. This may well prove to be the most momentous of all ecumenical enunciations, and still more space might have been given to it. The way in which its actual author, Bishop Einar Billing of Västerås, indicates the pitfalls of 'institutionalism, nominalism, and moralism', as vitiating insight into the nature of God's revelation as that of His prevenient Grace (*sola gratia*), and into the nature of the believer's response (*sola fide*), has not yet been pondered as it ought to be. This *History of the Ecumenical Movement* is a precious gift to one and all. Its writing and publication have been made possible by the generosity of the Disciples of Christ.

PETER KATZ

African Traditional Religion, by Geoffrey Parrinder. (Hutchinson's University Library, 8s. 6d.)

In this book Dr Parrinder takes into account the religion of all Africans south of the Sahara except the Hottentot and Bushman groups. It is an ambitious programme, but within the spatial limits set by this series he has admirably succeeded. He does me the honour to quote frequently from my writings and I am happy to find such close agreement in our views. The essence of the book is in Chapter 2: it is in fact a summary of what is to follow. After combating the notion that African religion is covered by the term 'Animism', he follows me in recognizing that there are three phases of it existing side by side: dynamism, spiritism, and theism. The rest of the book is taken up with an exposition of these phases and of the dominant part they play in African life. I have employed the term 'dynamism' to indicate the belief and practices that fall under the concept that there is a mystic potency or force (*dunamis*) immanent in human beings, animals, plants, objects, spirits, gods—what some Africans call *nyama* and others *bwanga*, *bongaka*. It is usually called 'magic' and distinguished from religion; but many observers are now agreed that it is extremely difficult (I should say, impossible) to separate them. While Dr Parrinder continues to use the word for convenience, he is aware that belief in so-called 'magic' relates to a hidden mystic neutral force that *works*, that can be tapped for good or evil purposes: an idea that is more clearly expressed by 'dynamism'. That there is room in African thought for personal as well as impersonal spiritual forces is made plain by Dr Parrinder's exposition of spiritism, the cult of 'nature gods' and 'hero gods'. Above all there is the belief, more or less strongly held everywhere, in God—Creator—source of all power. The discussions of belief and practice testify to essential oneness over the African religious field, the variations being a matter of emphasis rather than of content, even though in the centre and south we do not find the large pantheons that are characteristic of many western tribes. Everywhere 'religion enters into the life of every individual' and 'the whole organization of society is maintained by the spiritual forces that pervade it'. Anthropologists, and Dr Parrinder among them, leave no doubt that religious symbols, rites, dogmas, sacred places and persons are all important in giving African society cohesion and persistence. In his Epilogue our author says: 'The greatest danger in African religious life is that the old should disappear without some new religious force to take its place.' Dr Parrinder believes that Africans are so religious by nature that it is unthinkable that the new society that is coming into being can have a godless basis. Meanwhile he would have us take the traditional religion seriously, in the confidence that 'God spoke in time past to men in Africa and that African faith can be

led upward into African interpretations of the new religions'. His book is a valuable aid to that end.

EDWIN W. SMITH

Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, 1778-1869, by G. C. B. Davies. (S.P.C.K., 42s.)

'One of the most redoubtable ecclesiastical figures of the century' is Dr Davies's appraisal of the subject of his book, and he goes far to justify it. The author has written an absorbing account of a man in whom the British contemporary Press and public never lost interest. One feels that he dearly loved a fight. Quite early in his career his combative qualities displayed themselves. He took an active part in many of the disputes of his day, both civil and ecclesiastical, and the supporters of conservative policies almost invariably looked to him as a champion who would gain the public ear. To the last he fought against the Reform Bill of 1832 in the Lords and was amongst those who opposed the appointment of Hampden to the Bishopric of Hereford. He was an instigator of the famous Gorham case, concerning the Church-of-England teaching about Baptism, on the outcome of which the future position of the Evangelical party in the fold of the Anglican Church depended. Dr Davies has abundantly documented his work with contemporary letters and Press reports, which must have entailed much laborious research. Some of the controversies in which the Bishop engaged have long been dead and forgotten, except by students of the period, and they are treated with a wealth of detail that, at times, will become rather boring to the general reader. But the book as a whole holds our sustained interest, and we are left with a vivid impression of a fiery, self-opinionated, autocratic but courageous man, fighting a rearguard action against the forces of change, with a skill and pungency in dialectic that always made him a formidable antagonist. Dr Davies has given us a book for which all students of this period will be grateful.

W. L. DOUGHTY

Marriage Failure and the Children, by Claud Mullins. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)

This little book, the substance of the Beckly Lecture for 1954, is by a magistrate of some fifteen years' standing whose outlook is rather that of the social reformer than the purely legal leader. The essence of the argument is that divorce is at present mainly a legal process which goes forward regardless of the existence, much less of the welfare, of children of the marriage. The case is made out for conciliation, preferably before the legal process starts, for this is more a social than a legal matter. Probation Officers, Marriage Guidance Councils, as well as experienced lay magistrates, all have a contribution to make. Mr Mullins has hard things to say and telling figures to quote about the adverse effect of Legal Aid. He would dispense with the terms 'guilty' or 'innocent party', for he rightly assesses that the blame lies in varying degrees on both parties. The present system seems rather to encourage hard lying and in the very process to exacerbate the sufferings of children whose loyalty needs to be experienced to be believed. So emphatic is the author on the value of the family that he roundly states that the child of a broken family has 'at least double the chance of becoming delinquent'. He would, therefore, make the granting of a full decree of divorce dependent upon adequate arrangements for the maintenance and care of the children. While he admits that the Welfare State has greatly improved the lot of these children materially, he feels it has subtly robbed them of something much more important. This is quite true—so it is a pity the argument is spoiled by a dubious generalization from personal experience in comparing Victorian with modern attitudes and ways. A great plea is made for real preparation for marriage, for there is so much ignorance, first of what it involves, and secondly of the full effect of divorce. Here, surely, a guidebook of more recent date than twenty years ago might have been recommended. Those who know Sir Cyril Burt's work and attitude will be greatly amused at the subtle error of quoting him as a psychiatrist! This is an interesting and often provocative book.

J. WILSON WHEELER

The Romantic Movement and Methodism, a study of English Romanticism and the Evangelical Revival, by Frederick C. Gill. (The Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

It was well worth while to reprint this book, first published in 1937. After analysing the

notes of Romanticism—wonder, rapture, the emphasis upon the individual, vital and immediate feeling—the author shows that there are kindred trends in 'the evangelical experience'. But the peculiar glory of the Wesleys is that, uniting seeming incompatibles, they wedded Romanticism to Classicism, rapture to rule. That is why they have been misunderstood by one-sided friends and foes alike.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

continued from page 307

⁴¹ op. cit., p.122. Davies (op. cit., p.184) and Elliott-Binns (op. cit., p.320) both give Burnett's age at death as fifty-eight, on the authority, stated only by the first writer, of Seymour (op. cit., 1.276n.), who has 'in the fifty-ninth year of his age'. In the absence of any exact information relating to the day of his birth, we cannot be sure that Seymour, so often found wanting, is trustworthy here.

⁴² op. cit., in loc. This same notice asserts that Burnett was 'descended from a collateral branch of Bishop Burnet's family.' It also mentions a publication by Burnett in 1773: *A short Catechism intended chiefly for children and youth, on some of the main points of the Christian religion.*

POPULAR RELIGIOUS PLAYS AND PLAYS OF HIGH MORAL PURPOSE

A TIME TO BE BORN
Nativity Play. 8m. 3w. 3c.

LONELY ROAD
Incident on the Flight to Egypt.
2m. 7w.

LEGEND OF BABOUSHKA
Nativity Play. 15m. 13w. 8c.

THAT FELL ARREST
A 20th Century Morality. 2m. 3w.

A CERTAIN MAN
A Serious Play. 3m. 3w.

FAIR CHANCE
Realistic Play. 6m.

All Plays 1/8 except "Baboushka" (2/8). Plays are sent on approval. "Plays and their Plots" complete synoptical list, 1/- post paid.

"DEANE'S"

31 MUSEUM STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

M.Y.D. DRAMA SERIES

Advice is available for the selection of suitable plays for all types of Dramatic groups.

See also

A CATALOGUE OF RELIGIOUS PLAYS

Giving information about types of plays and cast required in each case.

Specially recommended

THE COST OF A DRINK BY H. & M. LIMB 6d.

A challenging one act play for eight players, with a completely new approach to the drink problem. Excellent for a Club or Guild production.

A KING IS BORN BY S. T. HARTSHORNE 1/-

A new Nativity Play in eight scenes for children and adults. Performing fee 2/6.

THE COAT BY SHEILA PARRY 1/-

The story of Joseph in lyrical verse. Simple and effective to produce.

MILITANT AND TRIUMPHANT BY JOHN & SHEILA GIBBS 2/6

A pageant of the Church. Nine episodes which can be performed separately (Performing fee 5/- or 2/6d. for single episodes).

Apply:

METHODIST YOUTH DEPARTMENT

LUDGATE CIRCUS HOUSE, LUDGATE CIRCUS, E.C.4.

From My New Shelf

By C. RYDER SMITH

Wilbert F. Howard, Appreciations of the Man by W. F. Lofthouse, H. G. Meecham, Edgar T. Selby, T. W. Manson, Ivan Lee Holt, and Maurice F. Howard, with a brief Representative Selection from his Addresses (The Epworth Press, 6s.). Of Methodist scholars who have passed away since Wesley died only some eight or nine have been eminent in the wider world of scholarship. Wilbert Howard was one of these few, but he was much more. To quote the opening words of this volume; 'Dr Howard will live in the minds of some of us as the scholar; of others as the preacher; of others again as a potent voice in Conference, or as one whose far-sighted wisdom and counsel made of him at once a father and a brother, one of those who bless others by the ideals they cherish and the standards they uphold.' Most of the writers deal especially with one or other of the realms where Dr Howard shone, but, all knowing him well, every one has found himself drawn to speak also of his *character*. There is remarkable uniformity about this theme. Every one of the six, from his colleague, of many years, Dr Lofthouse, to his son Maurice, says two things, 'Here was a *man* indeed, whose character out-soared his many great gifts', and 'Here was a Christian who *knew* Him whom he had believed'. May one who was not as intimate with him as these six but was still one of his friends, add his tribute to theirs? There are four Addresses—the Presidential Address, a broadcast sermon on 'March Breast Forward', a College Address entitled 'Some Thoughts on a New Translation of the Bible', and the 'Words of Welcome' to the Oxford Ecumenical Methodist Conference. How *thorough* Howard was in everything! There is also a fine reproduction of Arnold Mason's portrait. We are not told who prepared this volume, but we are all in his debt.

Revelation and Religion, Studies in the Theological Interpretation of Religious Types, by Herbert H. Farmer (Nisbet & Co., 17s. 6d.). One expects Gifford Lecturers to feed their readers with 'meat' and not with 'milk', and in this first series of his lectures Prof. Farmer is true to type. His 'meat', I need not say, is well worth mastication. His approach to religion is unusual. The word 'normative' is a keyword. He takes it for granted that Christianity—and, indeed, Christianity under a given definition—is the true religion and that all others must be judged by its standard. He begins with 'the affirmation . . . that God has made unique and final revelation of Himself as personal in history through Jesus Christ and through the personal relationship to Himself which that revelation makes possible and calls into being'. Perhaps the chief words here are 'history' and 'personal relationship'—by which the lecturer means the 'I—thou' encounter as over against the 'I—it' relationship. On examining this definition of the normative religion Prof. Farmer finds that it involves seven assertions about God—that He is 'the ontologically other'; that He is the 'axiologically other'; that He is 'personal'; that He 'makes an absolute claim upon the worshipper'; that He 'gives all', being 'the one utterly trustworthy saviour of man in his weakness and need'; that He is 'intimately present and active within the worshipper's own being'; and that there is a 'feeling-tone which accompanies and is appropriate to, the living encounter with God'. In this list one might have expected the explicit mention of salvation from *sin* and of the intimate fellowship with God called '*agape*'. Prof. Farmer, of course, refers to these quite often, but is that adequate when it comes to the definition of the Christian norm? In subsequent chapters, again, the lecturer makes only 'incidental reference' to the 'feeling-tone' as this 'characterizes all living religion', but surely in Christianity the 'feeling-tone' has its own climacteric *differentia*. Prof. Farmer conducts his exposition under an analysis of Christian worship, and shows how the doctrine of the Trinity is involved in the findings. He has next a lecture on 'Primitive Religion and Polytheism', in which he maintains, for instance, that such things

as 'the belief in the survival of the souls after death', 'the cult of ancestors' and 'the idea of *mana*', however closely connected with religion, are not *per se* religious. Next he discusses five types of real 'religions', but shows that they either omit some of the elements found in the norm, or distort its pattern, or both. Four of these he names the religions of 'absolute dependence', of 'ideal values', of 'introversion', and of 'obligation', with 'eudaemonistic religion' as fifth. Finally, there is an analysis of five 'elements' in religion—the 'corporate' and 'dynamic' elements, 'the elements of withdrawal and fulfilment', and 'the element of unification', the last being treated at greater length than the others. Some of these titles sound abstract, but readers will find that they are very able epitomes of the principles that underlie the complex manifold of the present concrete situation of religion in the world. For instance, under 'the element of unification' Prof. Farmer discusses mysticism and pantheism. I could wish, however, that, when he deals with Christian deviations from the norm, he had named more current examples. There is no doubt, as he seems to expect, that his account of the Church will be attacked. His definition of the norm as '*personal encounter*' is *per se* individualist, even though religion 'has certainly a profound and necessary connexion with group consciousness'. As I understand him, he would use Bowman's term 'adjectival' for the Church, classing it among *essential* adjectives. But does not 'encounterism' try to draw an ellipse with only one focus? Is not the statement 'No individual Christian without the Church' as 'substantial' as its complement 'No Church without individual Christians'? Perhaps Prof. Farmer will deal with this query and others in his second series of lectures. There is no need to say that his knowledge of current theological discussions is complete. There is, for instance, a searching scrutiny of Brunner's recent teaching. There is no room here to mention other instances of the value of this book, but Prof. Farmer's 'wine needs no bush'. To use another figure, the 'mantle' of Oman has fallen upon him, and he wears it worthily. There could not be higher praise.

Why the Church?, a Study of the Nature of the Church with special reference to the Writings of the Fathers, by John Foster (S.C.M., 5s.). In this little book Prof. Foster, leaving aside the problems under the question 'What is the Church?', shows its greatness by examples from history. He does this the more effectively because he does not ignore its failures and set-backs. He shows that in the New Testament it is defined, not just by what it is, but also by what it is becoming. He shows too that a belief in the Church is integral to a belief in the Gospel. He illustrates his theme, as always, by the aptest of quotations and illustrations, and he writes in an easy and engaging style that hides the skill that it exhibits. In an age that carps at the Church, this is a refreshing book. Prof. Foster is that rarity, an informed enthusiast. This is the very book both for people who ask 'Is the Church any good?', and for those who would vindicate the answer 'Yes'.

An Approach to Christian Doctrine edited by Greville P. Lewis (The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.). This book is in two parts sandwiched together in two dozen slices to suit the syllabus of the Local Preachers Examination, but easily separable. In one part nine Methodist scholars outline the chief Christian doctrines. In the other part, which might be called '*An Approach to Methodist Doctrines*', Dr John Lawson writes notes on twelve of Wesley's principal sermons, with an introduction. This is a book for beginners, but the writers, even when they do not say so, 'take into account the modern approach to theology and the present world situation'.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

Vital Elements of Public Worship, by J. Ernest Rattenbury (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). This book, which is specially addressed to Methodists, was first published in 1936. We do not usually review reprints, but, as this is a very rewarding book, here are the titles of the chapters—The Origins of Christian Worship, Development of Christian Worship, Balanced Worship, The Practice of Public Worship, and The Order of Holy Communion, an Explanatory and Devotional Commentary.

How Jesus Christ Saves Men, by Norman L. Robinson (James Clarke & Co., 12s. 6d.). In this book the author first gathers the biblical evidence for a doctrine of the Atonement, then describes and criticizes the historical theories, and finally draws out, with some repetitions, the meaning of the Cross for Jesus, for God and for the believer. His approach is historical, psychological, and practical.

Still with Thee, by Francis B. James (The Epworth Press, 6s.). A slightly abridged edition of a selection, first made in 1940, from the weekly devotional articles contributed by Mr James to *The Methodist Recorder*.

The World's Religions, a Short History, by Charles Samuel Braden (Abingdon Press, \$3). A revised edition, with a new chapter on the religions of the Aztecs, Mayas, and Incas.

Vocabulaire Biblique, published under the direction of Jean-Jacques von Allmen (Delachaux & Niestle, Neuchatel, Fr. Suisses, 21). Expositions of the meaning of the 'key-words of the Bible', which, omitting Hebrew and Greek terms, provide both a scholarly and 'a popular manual of biblical theology'.

Preaching Theology, by Eric Baker (The Epworth Press, 5s.). A series of seventeen articles, originally published in *The Preachers' and Class Leaders' Magazine*, which cover many of the chief doctrines of the Christian creed.

Dreams at Sunset, F. W. Boreham (The Epworth Press, 6s.). Dr Boreham is an old man now, but age has not palsied his pen.

The Man at the Bell and other short Sermons for Children, by A. Whigham Price (Independent Press, 5s.). The first nine of these thirty sermons deal with the great Christian festivals. Mr Price tells stories, of course, but his do not 'peter out' in vague moralizing.

The Highway of Our God, by Catherine Booth (Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, 4s. 6d.). This 'selection from the Army Mother's Writings' falls into three parts—'Entering the Highway', 'Threading the Highway', and 'Following the Highway Code'. The range is wide—e.g. there are chapters on 'The Faith that Saves', 'With Christ on the Offensive', and 'Women and the Ministry'.

Czechoslovak Protestantism Today, by Amedeo Molnar, with a Foreword by J. L. Hromádka (Central Church Publishing House, Prague). This book is an account of the eight Protestant Churches in Czechoslovakia, with a historical prelude, and a series of twenty-eight pages of excellent pictures, many of them illustrating Hussite times. The Communist State not only tolerates Protestantism, but, for instance, 'pays the salaries of its clergy'. This means that, rightly or wrongly, the Church has compromised with a Communist State. Though he does not say so, Dr Hromádka's long and able foreword is an attempt to explain and justify the grounds of this compromise.

Mushrooms on the Moor, Mountains in the Mist, The Other Side of the Hill, The Silver Shadow, by F. W. Boreham (Epworth Press, 5s. each). Here are reprints of four of Dr Boreham's well-known books, issued in a 'Uniform Pocket Edition'.

Atlantis, or The Crying of the Waters, by G. A. Watermeyer (Constantia Booksellers, 62, Loveday Street, Johannesburg). A volume of poems by a South African who stands high among writers in Afrikaans. The chief poem is 'a vision from veiled antiquity' which is 'at the same time prophetic of the future'.

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

The Salvationist at Prayer, by Captain Fred Brown (Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, 1s. 6d.). . . . *Who were There when they Crucified my Lord?*, by A. E. Gould (Independent Press, 1s.). . . . *Two Psalms* (23, 85), broadcasts by Nathaniel Micklem (Independent Press, 1s.). . . . *Unity* (of the Church and Churches), a pamphlet for 'Youth and Adult Discussion', by Geoffrey Paul (Cargate Press, 1s.). . . . *The Methodist Principles of Church Order*, by Edgar W. Thompson (The Epworth Press, 6d.). . . . *Deliverance*,

Challenge, Victory, an enlargement of broadcasts on 'The Heart of the Bible', by W. Gordon Robinson (Independent Press, 1s. 6d.). . . . *Thine is the Kingdom*, the Christian answer to the World's Challenge (a booklet for group study), by A. R. Vine (Independent Press, 1s.). . . . *The Bible, Historical, Social and Literary Aspects of the Old and New Testaments*, described by Christian Scholars (Times Publishing Co., 1s.).

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Journal of Theological Studies, April (Oxford Press, 18s.).

'I will go before you into Galilee', by C. F. Evans.

A Fifth-century Egyptian Abbot: I. Besa and his Background, by K. H. Kuhn.

The Doctrine of the Trinity: Some Further Thoughts, by Leonard Hodgson.

St Cyprian on the Papacy, by Maurice Bévenot.

The Expository Times, June (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 6d.).

Goguel's *Life of Jesus*, by C. Leslie Mitton.

Religious Broadcasting to Schools, by Robert C. Walton.

Is 'Q' an Aramaic Document?, by Frederick Bussby.

The Christian Hope and the Problem of Demythologizing (continued), by Rudolf Bultmann (translated).

do, July

Karl Jaspers and Demythologizing, by Ian Henderson.

The Late Prof. A. J. Gossip, by John Mauchline.

Otto's *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, by C. F. Evans.

Bible Teaching in the Faculty of Arts (in Universities), by F. F. Bruce.

do, August.

Resurrection and Apostolate in St Paul, by H. P. Owen.

H. Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl*, by A. J. B. Higgins.

Religious Education: Teaching the Gospels, by Margaret Avery.

Imitatio Christi (in N.T.), by W. F. Lofthouse.

Theology Today, July (Princeton, via B. H. Blackwell, Oxford, \$1).

A Theology of Involvement, by E. L. Allen.

The Liturgical Tradition of the Reformed Churches, by James H. Nichols.

Freedom Truth and Commitment in the Christian College by Harold A. Durfee.

The Hibbert Journal, July (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.).

Pharisee or Publican? (a reply to Douglas Jerrold), by Arnold J. Toynbee.

Proof in Philosophy, by Charles Perelman.

The Cave and the Sun, by Dorothy Tarrant.

The Role of the Writer in the Present World Crisis, by Kenneth Walker.

The Congregational Quarterly, July (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.).

A Call to Mission and Unity, by Kenneth Scott Latourette.

Retreat of the Christian Vanguard in France, by Howard Schomer.

The Refugee Problem since Amsterdam, by Elfan Rees.

The International Review of Missions, July (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.).

Syncretism as a Religious and a Missionary Problem, by Hendrik Kraemer.

The End of Missionary Work in China?, by Wilhelm Seufert.

The Sixth Buddhist Council, by Addison J. Eastman.

Problems and Prospects in West Pakistan, by J. W. Sweetman.

Studies in Philology, April (University of North Carolina Press, via Cambridge Press, \$2.50.).

Nine articles on a number of items in Renaissance literature (including one on 'Falstaff and the Mantle of Dick Tarlton'), followed by a bibliographical list of recent books and articles in various languages on the literature of the Renaissance, which covers two hundred pages.

Our Contributors

FRANK BAKER
B.A., B.D., PH.D.

Methodist Minister. Registrar of the Wesley Historical Society and Secretary of the Methodist Historical Society. Awarded first prize Eayrs Essay 1948 for *The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism* (printed in this Review, October 1948). Author of *A Charge to Keep* and *Charles Wesley as revealed by His Letters*.

OLIVER A. BECKERLEGGE
M.A., PH.D.

Methodist Minister. Previously school-master. Has made a special study of Anglo-Norman language and literature, Wesleyan hymnology, and Early Scottish Methodism. Member of the Wesley Historical Society, and contributor to its *Proceedings*, and to other journals.

PAMELA KELLY

Director and Producer of 'The New Pilgrim Players' (the company of the Religious Drama Society of Great Britain). Trained as actress at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art. Ex-member of 'The Pilgrim Players' under E. Martin Browne. Visited America in cast of *Murder in the Cathedral*. Has been Adviser on religious drama in Sheffield and Bristol.

WILLIAM MACHIN
M.A.

Methodist Missionary in India. Honorary Secretary of the Round Table Conference, and also of the Church Union Committee of the North India Provincial Synod of our Church.

CARINA ROBINS

Travelling Adviser of the Religious Drama Society of Great Britain, for which she has worked since 1945. Has produced plays, lectured, adjudicated, organized Schools and Courses, and has promoted all kinds of activities concerned with Religious Drama.

C. RYDER SMITH
B.A., D.D.

Principal, Richmond College, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, London University, 1932-40. President, Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1931. Author of many theological books.

W. SMITH

Private tutor in classics and modern languages.

CYRIL J. THOMAS

Methodist Minister. Played in school productions at King Edwards School, Birmingham, and later with a company of Guild Players acting in Shakespeare. Since entering the ministry, concentrated on drama in the Church, specializing in religious drama as producer. Has acted as drama adjudicator at many festivals, and adjudicated the London M.A.Y.C. Festival for the past four years. In 1944 began writing a monthly drama article in *Youth*, for the Methodist Youth Department which still continues. Has directed the M.A.Y.C. annual Displays in the Royal Albert Hall since 1950, and also the J.M.A. Jubilee Pageant for the Missionary Society. Since formation of Committee on Religious Drama has acted as convenor and later as secretary and technical adviser to The Methodist Drama Association, and served for some years on the Executive of the Religious Drama Society.

R. H. WARD

Writer, theatrical producer, and broadcaster. Formerly director of the Adelphi Players. Producer to the Century Theatre, etc. Author of *The Encounter*, *Twenty-three Poems*, *Holy Family*, *The Prodigal Son*, *The Westward Journey*, etc. (plays); *The Leap in the Dark* (novel).

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD
M.A., PH.D., D.D., D.LITT.

Minister of the City Temple Church, London. Author of *After Death*, *Psychology in Service of the Soul*, *Psychology and Religion*, *Jesus and Ourselves*, *Transforming Friendship*, *The Significance of Silence*, *When the Lamp Flickers*, etc.

A. SKEVINGTON WOOD
B.A., PH.D.

Methodist Minister: Superintendent, Paisley Mission. Sometime post-graduate scholar of Edinburgh University. Awarded doctorate in the department of Ecclesiastical History. Thesis: *The Life and Work of Thomas Haweis (1734-1820)*. Articles and reviews in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, *Evangelical Quarterly*, *Proceedings of Wesley Historical Society*, etc. Annual Lecturer, Scottish Reformation Society, 1952.

d
t
y
A.

d
-
ry
or

of
on
he
set
na

nd
he

in.
ed.
all

gy.
list

rd
ers

on
cer.

ted
944

dist
.C.

the
tion

r as
ion,

ama

the
or of

See,
).

death,
and

When

time
orate

and
s in
tory,
etc.

ladd.
ellern.



NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

APPOINTMENT WITH GOD

Some Thoughts on the Holy Communion

by J. B. Phillips

If we have been in the habit of regular attendance at Holy Communion, and yet have never felt ourselves to receive spiritual benefit, the fault—the author points out—is in ourselves and not in rite which was instituted by Christ. We ought therefore deliberately to examine ourselves, and this book will help us to do so.

5s. net.

THE BEST OF A. E. WHITHAM

With a portrait and a Memoir by his daughter

Those who remember Whitham, and especially those who heard him, will thrill again as they read the words of their friend, one of the most distinguished ministers of the Methodism of our time, and a true mystic. Those who will read these words for the first time have a fresh experience awaiting them; something profound and unique.

8s. 6d. net.

THE LORD IS KING

A book of Sermons

by Stanley K. Bridge

Like all real sermons these are about God; like all good sermons they are simple, practical, and in touch with everyday life; and like all really moving sermons they have qualities of vividness and imagination which penetrate the mind.

6s. net.

RADIANT RELIGION

by George Artingstall

The author maintains that religion, to be effective, must be personal, that it must spring from a heart on fire with the love of God. To serve God as we intend we must be very sure of our Leader and of our own surrender to Him.

Paper boards, 5s. net.

EVANGELISM AND PAGAN ENGLAND

by J. Ernest Rattenbury, D.D.

When a man can describe himself as an octogenarian, and preserves still the vision of youth together with the width and power of a deep and glowing experience of serving Christ, the book which results is likely to prove a real and certain inspiration to its readers. Dr. Rattenbury writes of the old evangelism, with its triumphs and glories, and of the new note which sounds in the evangel today.

10s. 6d. net.

THE LIFE OF MR. SILAS TOLD

by Himself

First published in 1786, this is at once a thrilling adventure story, a vivid piece of social history and a record of heroic religion.

6s. net.

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

WIND IN THE TREE TOPS

by T. Howard Crago

Many of life's good things improve with keeping, so that they may mellow, and achieve maturity; and among these things are the thoughts that go to make a book. The author has let his thoughts lie for a long time, tested them and proved them over the years.

6s. net.

WINDOW IN THE WEST

by Gilbert Thomas

These impressions and sketches, by turns "literary" and "intimate," were written in a West Country study overlooking sea, estuary, and hills. Some have West Country themes or colour: all represent a looking through the western window of life. Here is a quiet yet vivid book, in which imagination and spiritual vision, sympathy and humour, go hand in hand. The volume includes an essay on Thomas Hardy—"The Dark Horse"—which attracted much notice when it appeared in periodical form.

9s. 6d. net.

THE PRIEST AND THE SIREN

Literary Studies

by W. S. Handley Jones

These studies, reflective rather than pungently critical, are mainly of those literary giants who reached the summit of their achievements during the first thirty years of this century.

10s. 6d. net.

MIRACLE AT MIDNIGHT

by Tom Fleming

"An entirely novel type of Christmas play, couched in very beautiful poetry,"
by a young Scottish actor and dramatist.

6s. net.

SINCERE FLATTERY

Parodies from Punch

by G. H. Vallins

With a foreword by *Malcolm Muggeridge*, Editor of *Punch*.
Amusing but penetrating parodies of the great ones from Chaucer to
T. S. Eliot.

7s. 6d. net.

CHURCH AND SOCIETY

by Malwyn L. Edwards, M.A., Ph.D.

In this book certain lines of enquiry are opened up to stimulate thought on matters of first rate importance to those who seek the application of the Christian ethic in Society. These studies are intended for all Christians who are socially minded.

7s. 6d. net.

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

